federal provincial parks council
conseil fédéral-provincial des parcs

Proceedings

Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development

29th ANNUAL CONFERENCE
29e CONFÉRENCE ANNUELLE

Hotel Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland
July 17-20, 1990

Newfoundland and Labrador

92-01753/

Table of Contents

Federal Provincial Parks Council
29th Annual Conference
St. John's, Newfoundland

July 18, 1990
Morning Session

Official Opening 1

Address of the Minister of Environment and Lands
The Honourable Jim Kelland 4

Address by Councillor Tom Osborne 10

Report of Deputy Ministers' Meeting
Mr. Alan Appleby, Saskatchewan 15

Report on Park Officer Courses
Mr. Wayne Burley, New Brunswick 20

Report of Executive and Directors' Meeting
Mr. Charles Velay, FPPC Coordinator 23

Report on Parks Day 1990
Mr. Jake Masselink, British Columbia 27

Report of NASPD
Mr. Ney Landrum, Florida 30

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Jake Masselink, British Columbia 40

Question Period 45

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Gordon Prouse, Manitoba 47

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Norman Richards, Ontario 53

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Ian Robertson, Yukon 59

Question Period 62

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Barry Diamond, Nova Scotia 66

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Gerry Tranter, Alberta 70

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Wayne Burley 75
State of the Nation Report
Mr. Ian Rutherford, Canada 81

Question Period 87

Afternoon Session

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Douglas Murray, Prince Edward Island 89

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Peter Neugehauer, Northwest Territories 94

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Alan Appleby, Saskatchewan 100

State of the Nation Report
Mr. Don Hustins, Newfoundland 105

Question Period 109

Workshop "A"

Sustainable Development through Parks Systems Planning 115

World Wildlife Fund
Presentation by Arlin Hackman 118

Protected Areas Association
Presentation by Rick McCubbin 129

Province of Ontario
Presentation by Mr. Ken McCleary 146

Question Period 150

July 19, 1990

Morning Session

Workshop "B"

Parks' Role and Participation in Sustainable Development 175

Province of Manitoba
Presentation by Mr. William Watkins 176

Province of Saskatchewan
Presentation by Alan Appleby 184

Protected Areas Association, Newfoundland
Presentation by Dr. Jon Lien 195

Question Period 208

Workshop "C"

Two Case Studies 222

Province of Newfoundland
Presentation by Mr. Bob Halfyard 224

Question Period 251

Afternoon Session

Summary of Workshops 284

Open Discussion 284

Summary by Mr. Ian Rutherford 284

Summary by Mr. Gordon Prouse 292

Summary by Mr. Barry Diamond 296

Open Discussion 299

Conference Summary
1991 Federal-Provincial Parks Conference 313

Closing Remarks 315

Appendix A – Delegate List

Appendix B – Conference Agenda

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL PARKS COUNCIL
29TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND
JULY 18, 1990
MORNING SESSION

THEME: PARKS, PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OFFICIAL OPENING

MR. D. HUSTINS (Director of Parks, Department of Environment and Lands)(Chairman): I call the conference to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to welcome you to the province and to the capital city of St. Johns. I would like to extend a cordial welcome to all the federal, provincial and territorial park delegates and, certainly, also to the non-government organizations who are here today as well.

It is my pleasure, as Chairman of the Federal Provincial Parks Council for 1991, to welcome you to this 29th Annual Conference of the Federal Provincial Parks Territorial Agencies. A year and a half ago, our staff began the organization and planning for this event and all of the headquarter's staff in the division have had the opportunity to be involved in some aspect of the planning of this conference. No doubt, as you can see, they have worked very hard and very enthusiastically in preparing this program and, needless to say, we are very pleased to have the opportunity to host the conference and to give you an opportunity to get a taste of this province as well.

You all have a program and, as you can see, the next three days are going to contain a full agenda. While the delegates will be discussing parks matters related to sustainable development and parks planning, the non-delegate spouses and their children will be treated to a special program in and around the city.

We have several social events planned during the conference, including a trip to the national historic parks of Cape Spear and Signal Hill. For those of you who are not aware of it, at this point in time, Cape Spear is, in fact, the most easterly point in North America.

You will also be treated to many of our local traditional foods, including mussels, squid rings, cod tongues, salmon and, of course, the local cod fish. Those of you who were at the reception last night, I am sure, had your fill of squid rings and cod tongues.

The field trip scheduled for Friday will give all participants an opportunity to see some of our most impressive parks, in particular, the Witless Bay Ecological Reserve, which has hosted 230,000 pairs of Atlantic puffins and over 900,000 pairs of other seabirds. Both of these sites will be visited.

We shall also have the opportunity to see part of the Avalon Wilderness Reserve, which is host to over 5,000 woodland caribou. As you can well imagine, both of these parks are very much internationally renowned.

I hope that you enjoy the program and I certainly hope that you also go away with, indeed, a taste of Newfoundland.

Now, please give me an opportunity to fill you in on a couple of administrative matters. We have in the pre-function area a registration desk. Those of you who have not registered at this point in time, I encourage you to do so, certainly, no later than at the break this morning. If you need any assistance from any of our staff, do not hesitate to contact them. You will notice that all of the participants have identification cards: yellow cards for the non-delegates and the spouses, white for the delegates and blue for the Newfoundland park staff. So, any particular questions you might have with regard to the conference, do not hesitate to contact one of the staff with the blue cards.

The registration desk is going to be open pretty well all day long from 8:00 a.m. to 5 p.m. and we also have secretarial services available in the Garrison Room, here on the left, for photocoping as well.

If there are any messages delivered from your agency, just in case they are wondering what you are doing while you are here, they might want to get in touch with you, we will have them handled at the registration desk. We also have a display table out front. Any material you have on your own parks system or other products on your province, feel free to use the registration area and the display table to put the material on.

I would like, now, to introduce the Minister of Environment and Lands, who will give you greetings from the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Before doing so, I would just like to mention a couple of points of information. You may not have met the Minister before, but you are probably well aware of a couple of the issues that he faces in his district, other than the parks issues. Certainly, first and foremost, he has, in his district, the only PCB mobile incinerator in Canada and, no doubt, you have heard of that through the national news.

And the Minister also has the largest district in the province, which is Nascopy, and, of course, he also has the NATO technical training area in Goose Bay in his district, and I am sure you have heard of this.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the Honourable Jim Kelland, the Minister of Environment and Lands.

ADDRESS OF THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND LANDS

THE HONOURABLE JIM KELLAND

HON. J. KELLAND (Minister of Environment and Lands, Newfoundland and Labrador): Thank you, Don. Councillor Osborne, ladies and gentlemen.

When I first was about to enter provincial politics, I operated under the delusion that a district became famous because of the quality of its representative in the House of Assembly, but I noticed that Don sort of brought me back into context and Jim Kelland just happens to be reasonably famous, I suppose, in the province because I have a PCB incinerator and the possibility of a potential for a NATO base and, by that method, Don has given me a clear indication that he is, obviously, upwardly mobile and looking for promotion within our Department, and I will take that into consideration.

Yes, indeed, I do represent the largest, geographic district in the province and I have lived there for about 24 years, but I was born and raised in the city of St. Johns. Actually, Tom Osborne, the Councillor on behalf of the Mayor, has ordered from our Department today some of Labrador's weather so, hopefully, before the conference is over, we can help St. Johns out a little bit. But you are experiencing their aspect of the environment as well, I guess.

On behalf of Premier Clyde Wells - and, certainly, he needs no special introduction to the people of Canada - and the government of Newfoundland and Labrador, I take this opportunity to welcome you to the province and, along with your deliberations and the serious part of your conference, I hope you do have the opportunity to get outside. Some of you already have, as was indicated to me this morning. Get outside and experience life in the St. Johns context because I do think that they have a lot to offer here in the city. I know that you want to relax a little bit, but I also think that it is important that you do participate in the field trips as much as possible and whatever other social activities have been planned for you.

I note that the conference theme this year - Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development. To me that is an interesting thing. It is something that we have been attuned to, certainly, during this administration's tenure and that of the previous administration as well. We talk about sustainable development and protecting what we have in our parks, in particular.

As a minister of government, I realize the importance of development to our economy and, as the Minister of Environment and Lands, with responsibility for wildlife and parks, I also realize the importance of the protection of these various aspects of our environment in any development.

Our parks, including our wilderness areas, of course, play a major role in that sort of protection. The government of Newfoundland and Labrador - in particular, my department - has an ongoing commitment to the conservation and preservation of the natural resources while encouraging economic growth for our province. We have been called frequently a "have not" province and that is sort of a sad thing when you consider the fact that we have such vast resources here. That will change. Premier Wells and the current administration say so, and you can believe that.

During the past year, we have done some things and I was very pleased to announce the establishment of a full reserve status for the Baie du Nord area. That is on the island part of the province and is an area which probably takes in very close to 3,000 square kilometers and, along with the adjacent wildlife reserve, up around 3,500 square kilometers. That was a major effort on the part of the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council and the Parks and Wildlife Divisions of my department. The key elements of this reserve include protection of the Baie du Nord River, which is a potential candidate for the Canadian Heritage River System, the protection of a large caribou herd and several biotic systems. I think we made a big step when we did that and I do express thanks to WERAC for about 10 years work, I believe, in bringing that to the final stages where we could announce it, recently, a few months back, in the House of Assembly.

The parks division of our department is responsible for the administration and management of 92 protected areas, which are comprised as follows: 13 wilderness and ecological reserves, 34 natural environment parks, 21 outdoor recreation parks, 20 natural scenic attractions and 4 park reserves.

My first year on the government side of the House was last year and, last summer, I had the opportunity to get around a little bit. I visited, in fact, 25 of our parks and I am not saying that it is unusual that a minister does get to visit parks, but a couple of little things happened about which I told our fellows after I returned. Every time I came back from a road trip, I did a little report - and I was not an inspector, that was not my job - but I wanted to go out and sort of get a better feel for what we were offering in our parks.

I went to Pistolet Bay, which is the northernmost part that we have in our system on the island part of the province. I had, earlier in the year, sent a letter around saying that I would probably be making informal visits as time and schedule permitted at the various park locations. I walked in and introduced myself to the park ranger and I said, "Hello, I am Jim Kelland, I am your new Minister". He turned around and said to his colleagues, "Boys, the new United Church Minister is here". So, even though it is far north, a little north of St. Anthony, that actually happened.

When I got down to Catamaran Park, which is on the Trans Canada, one of the park rangers was there and I said, "I am Jim Kelland, your new Minister". He said, "Yes, Mr. Kelland, we received a copy of your letter and we knew you were going to arrive". And he gave me a great tour of the park. I talked to about five or six campers and started to get a feel for some of the problems that the campers and park users have. When we finished the little tour, he said, "Oh, sorry, excuse me, but I forgot your name". That did not bother me that much. It was not Nascopy, there were no votes out that way. I said, "Well, I am Jim Kelland." And he said, "And your the Minister?" And I said, "Yes". And he said, "Geez, I never saw one of those before." So, that indicated to me, really, that I should be getting out a little bit.

So, I really found that human. I was not in my three-piece suit and I think most people expected that when I sent the letter out, i.e. that the Minister would arrive in whatever his budget allowed for the latest fashion, along with the Deputy Minister and maybe a couple of ADMs and a couple of directors. They would come in and everybody would spit and polish, but I did not do it that way. I wore my jeans and tee shirt - and you ought to see some of my tee shirts. I did get a better feel for what we are offering there.

I got a little bit off track, sorry, in listing our parks and so on, but I found it interesting. I hope that time allows me to do the same thing this year. I really also think that our staff appreciates the fact that we, at the government level, the political level, have some interest in what they are doing. I would like to think that Environment and Lands and Wildlife and Parks are operating as a team. Some of the thrust that we are going to be doing, as Jim Inder and the others can tell you, is to make a better presentation, i.e. that government is not there to hinder you, but there to help you. Unfortunately, most people think that government rules and regulations in parks and so on are just a hinderance and slow down the process of what people are trying to do.

Now, several other areas, by the way, are being considered by Parks and the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council to add to the system I have just mentioned. These areas include a portion of the Torngat Mountains in Labrador, as well as the main river of the northern peninsula. Now, if any of you have not been to Labrador, I would recommend that to anybody. As I have said, I have lived there for 24 years and it is just a whole new concept of what the province of Newfoundland and Labrador is all about. You would really appreciate and enjoy any visit you have an opportunity to make up there.

As part of our commitment to protected areas, we are involved with the Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland and Labrador and World Wildlife in defining natural regions of the province. This will help identify new areas which are in need of protection. We are committing $22,000.00 to this project this year. I do not want to drag this on and take up a lot of your valuable time, but I do wish you well in your discussions. I do encourage you to step outside whenever you get the opportunity and participate in the social activities and, certainly, the field trips that are planned for you and, perhaps, on a future occasion, we will have an opportunity to talk again. I know that tomorrow night we will be all together again.

I wish you all the very best and thank you very much for having me here this morning. Thank you, Don.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Minister. When the Minister made a remark that he had made some small reports following his field trips, I guarantee you that they were not small. We had a lot of good interaction and good discussion afterwards.

The Minister has to leave shortly this morning because he has a Wildlife Conference on car-moose incidents so, if you do not mind, he will be leaving sometime later on during the proceedings.

I would now like to introduce our city representative. Mayor John Murphy is not able to make it this morning so, in his place, representing City Council, is Councillor Tom Osborne.

ADDRESS BY COUNCILLOR TOM OSBORNE

MR. T. OSBORNE (City Councillor, St. John's): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, ladies and gentlemen. I am very, very happy to be here this morning to bring greetings on behalf of His Worship the Mayor and all my colleagues on Council. I have always had an interest in Parks. I have been on the CA PIPI(ph) Parks Commission here as a member and vice-president for six years, and that is as long as anybody can serve.

I have also been a part of the Quidi Vidi-Renes(ph) River Development Foundation, and that will show the interest that I have, apart from the use that my wife and I and my six kids will always put into our local parks.

I have been across the country from the beautiful Stanley Park to Banff, back to our own beautiful Gros Morne, Taranova Park and, on the local scene here in the city, the CA PIPI Park, of which I am very, very proud to boast. CA PIPI Park has some wilderness and some passive areas. It has the foundation now for a rail museum. It has some boating and it has a beautiful campground where one would feel completely in the wilderness when you are there, but you are sitting basically on the seat of the provincial government within a stone's throw away from Confederation Building.

We will soon be able to boast of a world-class fluvarian. We do have a world-class botanical garden. We have, under construction and soon to be opened, the PIPI Park, an 18-hole tour golf course. We also have a 9-hole course that is presently functioning. I am very, very proud to be able to say that, on the municipal level, we have some beautiful parks. Some of you had the opportunity last evening to visit Bowring Park and I think that, maybe, the Deputy Mayor may have been in there, I think she was supposed to go. I would like to tell Jim that it is better to have some PCBs, in Chinese opinion, in your area, than some Liberal hornets. Our Deputy Mayor is also a member of the opposition, so the little bantering back and forth will continue for ever and ever.

I would like to welcome you here and ask you to get out and enjoy some of this beautiful city. It is steeped in history and, if you have an opportunity, apart from your regular tours, to have a look around, I am sure that you will enjoy it. We are known for our hospitality.

If you have the opportunity, you will see that we are graced with some beautiful parks. We all have a magnificent inheritance, I believe, anybody that has an interest in parks. We have inherited directly from God some beautiful backdrops and it is up to us to create the beauty around those backdrops, keeping in mind that a place of beauty will be used forever. You all have some great responsibilities.

Please stay, enjoy our city and thank you for having me.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Councillor Osborne.

In terms of hospitality, you are, indeed, correct. I would also like to take the opportunity here this morning, on behalf of the Parks Council to thank you and the city for hosting a large part of our event in Bowring Park last night. Thank you, once again.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would now like to give you some remarks on our conference, the theme and some update on the FPPC activities.

It is, obviously, going to be a very busy year for Ccouncil 1990-91. Following our successful conference in Regina last August, a number of important things have occurred. Perhaps the most significant of those was the implementation of the first Parks Day on June 9th of this past year.

All federal, provincial and territorial member agencies of Council participated in the first, nationwide Parks Day. This program was agreed to by Parks Ministers in 1989 and, I believe, probably represented the first program that the ministers, as a group, agreed to.

In May of this year, the Federal-Provincial Council of Deputy Ministers for Parks also met in Regina to discuss several matters, in particular, to begin the process for a minister's meeting this September. This meeting is now scheduled for September the 13th and 14th in this very hotel. Council also continued with the Parks Officer Course in Administration and Management, both in Alberta and New Brunswick, with approximately 40 participants participating and graduating in the course.

Also, in May of this year, a Parks Research Workshop was organized and hosted by British Columbia which was also attended by many of the parks agencies and you shall be hearing more about several of those matters in a few minutes from the various committee reports.

Let us take a minute or two to look at the conference theme, "Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development". This theme was specifically chosen by Council this year so that, as members, we could discuss the whole idea of sustainable development. The concept of sustainable development originated from the World Commission on Environment and Development, and as a result of that, of course, we are all familiar with the Brundtland Report.

This report stated that humanity has the ability to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. The concept of sustainable development implies limits, limits which are imposed by the present state of our technology and our social organizations on the environmental resources and the ability of the biosphere, of course, to absorb the effects of all these human activities.

The Brundtland Report clearly stated that political action is required to begin managing our environmental resources to ensure both a sustainable, human progress and even human survival. Those of us who are responsible for managing and protecting our natural resources cannot be isolated from the economic aspects of society. Our network of parks and protected areas are, indeed, important elements in this area of global concern.

Sustainable development is an agenda which involves global issues related to poverty, pollution, energy, industry and even survival. Sustainable development also includes parks and protected areas. Now, we are all well aware of the global conservation move to sustain the development of the world resources. There is also a similar move to protect more of our natural resources by designating them into protective parks status.

As indicated a few minutes ago by the Minister, we have, in fact, made major strides in this province only a few months ago. The designation of the Baie de Nord Wilderness Reserve of around 3,000 square kilometers saw our parks system double in size overnight. With the designation of the Baie de Nord area, we have the largest wilderness reserve in Atlantic Canada and, I believe, based on the records that we have in terms of other agencies, perhaps, the fifth largest, wilderness reserve in Canada itself. With the inclusion of the Baie de Nord Wilderness Reserve in recent months into protective status, the woodland caribou area in Ontario, a few years ago, Yetakiki(ph) in Manitoba a few years ago, Grasslands National Park in Saskatchewan and Clearwater in Saskatchewan, all in recent years, I think Canada is, obviously, taking its stewardship role very seriously in protecting our wildlands.

We have organized workshops at this conference which will give each agency and each individual the opportunity to exchange ideas and experiences on this important matter. The presentations and discussions during the next few days will assist each of us and Council, in particular, in developing a strategy to meet the conservation and environmental challenges of the next decade. In this regard, I hope you enter the workshops enthusiastically, be willing to share, be willing to discuss your experiences and pass them on to others.

I thank you for your attention.

Perhaps, I can call on those individual members who are presenting reports this morning to come up here to the head table. We have Alan Appleby reporting on the Deputy Minister's Meeting; Wayne Burley, Parks Officer Course; Charles Velay; Jake Masselink on the Parks Day; and Ney Landrum with an update from the U.S.

I will start by calling on Alan Appleby to present a quick update of the recent Deputy Minister's Meeting held in Regina. In terms of format for these reports, we will not have time for individual questions following the presentations. I would suggest that you save your questions for coffee break and get a hold of those individuals at that point in time.

REPORT OF DEPUTY MINISTERS' MEETING

MR. ALAN APPLEBY, SASKATCHEWAN

MR. A. APPLEBY (Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, Saskatchewan): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am glad that you are Mr. Chairman this year and I am not because I can relax and enjoy myself a little bit and you can take care of all the administrative details. So far, things are going very well. It has been a wonderfully-organized conference and we are looking forward to two more of the same.

Good morning to all of you. I am pleased to be able to make a brief report to you on the Deputy Ministers' Meeting. It was held in Regina on May 1st and it was held in Regina in spite of the fact that Saskatchewan was not at that time actually the host agency for the FPPC, given that there had been some problems in getting everybody together earlier in the year. We tried to plan on a meeting in March, but, due to budget and other problems, it was just too difficult to convene a meeting of Deputy Ministers.

I think it was a very successful meeting. I have been to several of our Deputy Ministers' Meetings - I think four of them in about the last six years - and we had six Deputy Ministers there; up until the last minute, we were expecting eight. There were also four Assistant Deputy Ministers and two Directors; there was only one province that was not represented. Given the circumstances of the day, that was an excellent turnout and it shows a very high interest in the Parks business by all of the agencies that participated across the country. As the agency that organized the meeting, we were very pleased to have such an excellent turnout.

Just in terms of the agenda, I will run quickly through the agenda items that were discussed by the Deputies and give you just a brief indication of some of the follow-up activities that will be taking place as a result of them.

First of all, there was an update report on the Canadian Heritage Rivers System. It was presented by the Chairman of the Canadian Heritage Rivers Board, Mr. Don Hustins, a man who is doing double duty both this year and this week. We owe a lot of credit to Don for taking on the tough challenge of handling both of those organizations in one year. So, there was a brief update report to bring the Deputy Ministers up to date on the Heritage Rivers System.

Secondly, there was a discussion on World Heritage Sites, a presentation which was made by the Canadian Parks Service, just outlining the World Heritage Sites Program and the opportunities for designation.

Thirdly, the Canadian Parks Service also presented an information item on the Green Plan. I think most of you will be familiar with the Green Plan probably in your own jurisdictions and are involved in the discussions and consultations and, hopefully, will be further involved in what is shaping up to be an important part of our sustainable development activities across Canada.

Fourthly, there was a discussion on Canadian Heritage Lands, a concept that many of you will remember - in my memory at least - originated in 1985, from the Centennial of Parks, the Canadian Assembly and the Task Force on National Parks - what was the official title of the task force? - anyway, the Vision 2000 group which made their report in 1987, and there has also been some follow-up work on the concept of Canadian Heritage Lands.

Fifth on the agenda was a discussion of Parks Day. Every jurisdiction around the table was given an opportunity to briefly outline the types of plans that they had made for the upcoming Parks Day. At that point in time, we were just a little over a month away from it and it was interesting to note what the various agencies had planned and to compare notes on how well things were being co-ordinated. I think, in retrospect, we will have a report from Jake here on Parks Day.

The sixth item on the Deputy Ministers' agenda was Parks Systems Planning and Protected Areas. There was a discussion of that matter. It got into things, Arlin, that you were interested in, the Endangered Spaces Program, the progess of systems planning across the country, and the dedication and interest of the various Parks agencies in putting together a parks system broadly to meet the objectives that we each had laid out.

Item number seven concerned sustainable development and there is follow-up going on. Sustainable development, obviously, the theme of this conference, concerns sustainable development. The workshops here will be involved in discussions and, hopefully, some follow-up in the sustainable development field to help outline the principles that parks espouse in sustainable development and the role that parks can play.

Item number eight was a discussion of the operations manual. I hope that many of you have been exposed to it in draft form already. The operations manual is something that was undertaken over the last year to provide the FPPC, the Council of Directors and the Conference with basically an administration manual. We have been together for almost 30 years and we have never, in one place, collected all of the information that tells us what we do and how we do it. As our membership changes, some of those things tend to get lost and some of our history is also archival in nature, I suppose, in helping to carry some of our history forward. There was a discussion on the operation's manualand I think that it was the first time that the Deputies, as a group, had an opportunity to take a look at how the Council of Directors operates and to make some comments on our modus operandi.

Item number nine was the presentation of a proposal for a National Junior Naturalist Program. That is something that came out of Council's deliberations last year and something that

Saskatchewan has been in the forefront in developing what, I think, in the future, could perhaps develop into a nationwide program that all parks systems would carry in the field of a Junior Naturalist Program. This would be to get children, who are our park users and our park future, interested and educated about the values in parks and to also know more about the environment, environmental issues, and parks issues so that, as they grow up, they will have that appreciation and they will be informed users and advocates for parks.

Finally, the tenth and final item on the Deputy Ministers' agenda was the agenda for the Ministers' Meeting and this, obviously, was one of the most important items that they discussed. As Don mentioned, Parks Ministers will be meeting in this hotel in September and, obviously, it is very important to the Deputy Ministers to have a good feeling for the agenda that the Ministers will be bringing forward. Many of the items that I have already discussed in this brief report are items that will appear on the Ministers' agenda for their information, for their discussion and for their decision and I am very hopeful and quite positive that we are going to have a successful meeting and that it will be a step forward for the parks systems in Canada to have the Ministers getting together.

At our previous Park Ministers' Meeting, obviously, the first Parks Day in Canada was inaugurated. I did not really think about it until you mentioned it, Don, but I guess you are right, it really was the first, national-scale program that we have all done together and put on for the public. I never really thought of it in those terms, but it makes you feel good to think about it that way. So, we are looking forward to more of the same coming from the Ministers' Meeting in September, in establishing a tradition of putting parks on that agenda and having things happen at that level nationally.

So, all in all, I think it was a very successful meeting, it was well attended, it lasted for the full allotted time during the day, I think we closed off just a little late. There was good discussion by all agencies and good participation. A lot of work went into the preparation in terms of background papers by many of the member agencies and the Deputies left us with a legacy of follow-up which, as directors in agencies, I am sure many of the folks in the room have been involved in. Obviously, that is leading us on to the Ministers' Meeting.

If anybody has any further questions or wants to discuss the Deputies' Meeting, I would be glad to talk to you during any of the time that we have in the conference. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Alan. I would now like to call on Wayne Burley from the Province of New Brunswick to give you a report on both the Alberta and the New Brunswick Park Officer Courses. Wayne.

REPORT ON PARK OFFICER COURSES

MR. WAYNE BURLEY, NEW BRUNSWICK

MR. W. BURLEY (Director of Technical Services, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage, New Brunswick): Thank you, Don. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. A tradition of the Federal-Provincial Parks Council has been the sponsoring of Park Officer Courses. This year, both a western and an eastern course are scheduled. A very successful western course was held last year at Hinton, Alberta. The course dates were September 24th through to

October 7th, 1989 and last year's course attracted 20 participants from agencies as far east as Ontario.

The western course has been the responsibility of Gerry Strudwick and Andy Nowicki of Alberta Recreation and Parks. Gerry is retiring from the provincial government and will not be involved in this year's course. I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of Federal-Provincial Parks Council, to wish Gerry the best in his retirement and to certainly express our appreciation to him. We would ask Jerry Tranter to take back to Gerry Strudwick our appreciation for the outstanding contribution that this individual has made over the years to the Park Officer Course.

As was mentioned earlier, both courses are scheduled for 1990, the western course at Hinton in late September-October and the eastern course at the Maritime Forest Rangers School in Frederiction starting September 16th. The eastern course is, once again, being coordinated by Phil Ossenger (ph) of our Department, the New Brunswick Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage.

With the assistance of the Secretary of State and the province of New Brunswick, simultaneous translation will be provided for all classroom sessions of the eastern course. The eastern course is fully subscribed at this point and we certainly, in New Brunswick, appreciated the early commitment which the agencies have made to our course.

Both courses last two weeks and each day is utilized to the fullest with morning, afternoon and evening sessions. In each case, the course begins with a four-day session on management development which is specifically geared to people working in a parks environment. During the evening session, candidates make presentations about some aspect of their parks system. Week two includes subjects such as marketing parks, service planning, enforcement in the park environment, maintenance of the parks plant, managing forest stands, visitors' services and current trends; obviously, a full plate of subjects.

In the middle of each course is a three-day field trip. I am sure that, for most candidates, it is a highlight of the course. For the 1990 eastern course, the field trip will visit New Brunswick's two national parks, four provincial parks in the southern part of the province, the site of the proposed West Isles National Marine Park, and the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, located on Campobello Island in the Bay of Fundy.

For the Western course, the field trip visits provincial parks in Alberta and British Columbia as well as Banff and Jasper National Parks. For 1990, the cost for each course has been set at $1,100.00 per participant and, once again, a maximum of 20 participants are accepted in each course.

The Park Officer Course in Park Management and Administration offers an excellent opportunity to be part of a first-rate training experience covering all major aspects of the parks field. As well, this type of course is an ideal venue for the informal exchange of ideas, new trends, programs and the like. The intent of the course is to provide the opportunity for broadening and upgrading knowledge and park operations, and this will improve employee effectiveness and services to the public. It is certainly my understanding that employees who are able to take the Park Officer Course consider it a privilege despite two solid weeks of hard work. I feel that this fact is very much a credit to the course coordinators and reflects their first-rate efforts and dedication to the courses.

For the upcoming year, a goal of the FPPC is to arrange a get-together of the course coordinators, together with a representative from the east and the west and a representative of the Canadian Parks Service, to support them to encourage a closer working relationship and an opportunity to compare notes and plan for the upcoming courses. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Wayne. Just as a note for Wayne and the Alberta representative here, at the Executive Directors' Meeting the other morning, we agreed to recognize Mr. Strudwick's participation in the Park Officer Course by following up with a letter of thanks for his support and assistance in the Park Officer Course over the years and, of course, congratulations on his retirement. That will be done very shortly.

I would now like to call on Charles Velay, our Coordinator for Council, to give you a report, as much as he can give you a report, on what we discussed yesterday at our Directors' Meeting.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTORS' MEETING

MR. CHARLES VELAY, FPPC COORDINATOR

MR. C. VELAY (Coordinator, Federal-Provincial Parks Council): Thank you, Don. As usual, the Meeting of the Executive and Directors was burdened with some 35 agenda items and a great deal of attention was spent in the morning on some of the earlier items. As the day progressed, they got rather speeded up and referred to a little later.

It occupied the Directors from 8:00 o'clock yesterday morning till 5:30 p.m. Many of the items that I have noted here have already been covered, but I think the significance is worthwhile to record again.

A great deal of the subjects that were discussed were a result of the Deputy Ministers' Meeting in May as outlined by Alan Appleby earlier. As also stated earlier, Canada's Parks Day, the very first such event by the FPPC, had been approved by the Ministers in Quebec and British Columbia was assigned the role of coordinating this important event which became a success. I am sure that it will continue every year as an initiative of the Council.

A paper entitled "Promoting Sustainable Development - A Special Role for Parks" was submitted by Manitoba. This comprehensive paper proposes a statement of principles recognizing that parks are an essential component of a nationwide, sustainable-development strategy. A final position paper will be completed by Manitoba and be a subject of discussion at the Parks Ministers' teleconference in August.

A draft statement on parks systems planning was presented by Canadian Parks Services. A workshop later today will provide a forum for discussion of this important document and assist in finalizing a series of broad, common principles for parks system planning in Canada.

As noted earlier, the operations manual became a topic of discussion. This strategic guide for administration and functions of the Federal-Provincial Parks Council was proposed and developed by Saskatchewan, essentially, by Ms. Linda Langford of Saskatchewan Parks.

In addition to procedural matters respecting annual conferences, meetings and budgetary matters, the manual traces the history of the Council, outlines its purposes and its policies and records the annual conferences and their themes since 1962. Minor amendments are required to this document and Saskatchewan will be handling this to have it in a final form this year.

The Parks Ministers, as indicated earlier, will meet on September 13th and 14th and the many discussions that have taken place are assisting in finalizing the agenda for this meeting.

An initiative prepared by Saskatchewan, called the National Statistical Base, for the purpose of compiling a variety of park facts and statistics, was tabled. Over the years, this has been a difficult era for the Federal-Provincial Parks Council and its agencies in trying to find some common mechanism to record a whole variety of issues governing parks because of the different agencies and the different styles of recording information that they each use, but Saskatchewan has presented a document which will facilitate this in the future. It has been approved, it will be introduced this year and it will form part of the State of the Nation Report that is published each year and tabled at this conference.

A resource extraction paper prepared by Manitoba is now complete and it was tabled at the conference for final printing and distribution. There were numerous other papers that were presented, many of which have been tabled for further study and for reassignment to the January meeting. An example is the proposal by Saskatchewan to establish a National Junior Naturalist Program, as outlined by Alan Appleby earlier.

Canadian Parks Service has tabled a draft of a state of protected areas in Canada. This document, when finalized, will form part of the 1991 State of the Environment Report.

The future conferences of the Council were outlined. The 1991 Conference will take place in British Columbia at Campbell River, the salmon fishing capital of B.C.. The theme will be "Fostering Participating Stewardship." It is expected that a great variety of delegates will be invited there to present as many opposing views as exist on the issue of parks and protected lands.

The 1992 Conference will be held in Manitoba. And 1992 is the 30th anniversary of the Federal-Provincial Parks Council, so it promises to be a good one.

The 1993 Confernce will take place in Ontario. The possibility of holding a joint conference with the Association of State Park Directors has been explored. I am sure that Mr. Ney Landrum of the State Parks Directors' Conference will address that subject.

The next meeting of the Directors will take place in Ottawa on January 9th and 10th.

This year for the first time, the State of the Nation Report has been made available to all the delegates and copies were available at the registration desk. The spring issue of the newsletter of the FPPC was published to coincide with this conference also. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Charles. You did an admiral job summing up all those things that we discussed from 9:00 o'clock in the morning yesterday until around 5:30 p.m.

Just a note with regard to one of the items that Charles mentioned, the operations manual, Linda Langford from Saskatchewan, who did all the work on this, is here in the audience so, if anyone has any questions of her later on during the next couple of days, by all means, contact Linda. Linda was also extensively involved in the statistical base material as well. Thanks, Linda.

I would now like to call on Jake Masselink from the Province of British Columbia to give us a report on the first Parks Day 1990.

REPORT ON PARKS DAY 1990

MR. JAKE MASSELINK, BRITISH COLUMBIA

MR. J. MASSELINK (Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Parks, British Columbia): Thank you, Don. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here. I find Newfoundland a fascinating place. Not only are they a half an hour out of step with most of Canada, but, at the door, they say that it is the 29th Conference. Yesterday, our good Chairman told us that, two years from now, it is going to be the 30th, and Charlie so reported it to us right now. It is a fascinating place.

In regard to Parks Day, you have heard several people talk about this magnificent decision that the Parks Ministers made, just over a year ago, to hold a Parks Day at the tail end of Environment Week which, this year, was June 9th, 1990. Now, Parks Day was instituted, upon our recommendation, to increase public awareness and support for parks across the couintry to look beyond just our individual jurisdictions, provincial boundaries, and look at Canada as a nation within a world context. And that is really what the intent of Parks Day was. It was to broaden public awareness.

So, we celebrated that on the 9th of June. The theme was "Canada's Parks - A Public Trust, Society's Treasures". It was the first annual, nationwide event coordinated by B.C. and carried out by all provincial and federal parks agencies across Canada, as well as, I trust, the territories even though you were still snowed in and frozen up.

All agencies were generally enthusiastic about the event and, yesterday, at the Directors' Meeting, I left a copy of a follow-up analysis that we undertook of all of the events and recommendations and suggestions that were made.

Now, just to summarize some of the events is kind of interesting when you have 13 jurisdictions involved in something like that because you have a lot to draw upon. That was one of the real benefits that we found from participating in Parks Day. It made us, as agencies and staff within our agencies, look beyond our borders and link in right across the country. And there are contacts now well established that keep on building and sharing of information. So, it is not just this conference, but this conference is really a stimulus throughout each of their agencies.

Some of the events that were successful were things like participatory events, official openings and ceremonial activities with dignitaries, and events piggybacked with others that worked well together. We had open houses in various districts and parks operations, joint-agency ventures, visitors' programs, both in our historic parks and in our nature-based parks, kids' events, park cleanups, school contests to name parks, tree plantings, events involving park and community volunteers, family events, fishing demonstrations, fish fries, workshops and radio broadcasts. We even had CBC hooked to sponsor on Cross Canada Checkup on the the 10th of June, the day after, to do a nationwide, phone-in program on parks. However, we got Meeched and maybe that can take place next year.

We also had birdwatching, canoe trips, games, family barbecues, recreation events, crafts, children's festival displays, cruises for the media and dignitaries. We sucked them all in. We had a good time across the country.

However, on reflection, the recommendation is that it is nice to link in with the Environment Week, but it is too early in the season. So, yesterday, when we discussed this, we recommended that mid-July would be a better time to designate Parks Day and that is what we will be recommending to our Honourable Ministers this year. However, at the same time, we want to take as much advantage of Environment Week as possible, so we will probably link parks events in with Environment Weeks across the country as an informal sort of thing and, formally, have Parks Day on, I believe, the third Sunday in July.

Regarding the coordination, there were some other recommendations that were administrative. Of course, British Columbia wanted to get rid of the job of coordinating and so we came up with a suggestion that whoever hosts the Provincial Park Conference the following year should really coordinate Parks Day the year before and Manitoba volunteered to accept that recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Jake. I do not know if I should respond to that 30 year-29 year remark made earlier or not. I guess if you are here in Newfoundland now for many, many, many years and have gained a half an hour, it can amount to one year. How about if we leave it at that?

I would now like to call upon Mr. Ney Landrum. Ney is the Executive Director of the U.S. National Association of State Park Directors, Charles Velay's counterpart in the American situation.

REPORT OF NASPD

MR. NEY LANDRUM, FLORIDA

MR. N. LANDRUM (Executive Director, U.S. National Association of State Park Directors, Florida): Well, thank you very much, Don. I too am delighted to have this opportunity to be with you for this conference. I have now visited eight of the Canadian provinces, all of which are very beautiful in their own way. I am delighted to have this opportunity, finally, to see Newfoundland. I too have been a little confused by the time, but I am about to work that out. But I do have one minor complaint, Don. In the advance mail-out you were not explicit enough about the weather for us Floridians. Fortunately, I did throw in a thermal undershirt before I left home, but I can tell you that there is about a 30 degree difference between here and Florida. I think somewhere in between would be about right.

I would first like to express greetings from our current President, Doug Aikin of North Dakota and also convey his regrets at not being able to be here. He had a conflict that he was very unhappy about which prevented him from being here, but he especially wanted me to convey his greetings and appreciation for the invitation.

Actually, my being here represents sort of a full circle for me. It was my good fortune to be serving as President of the

National Association of State Park Directors in 1979 when this exchange between our association and yours was initiated. I cannot take credit for initiating it, that was your doing, but we were the ones who benefited from it and I seized upon the invitation that year to join you at your meeting in Winnipeg. I know that Barry Diamond was there, but I do not know if any of the rest of you were, but it was a real eye-opening experience for me.

We have learned a lot from you over the years, including a lot about parks, but, especially, we have learned about discipline and decorum and sobriety, things that were a little alien to us in the conduct of our affairs. There is quite a contrast. I walked in on that meeting in Winnipeg not knowing what to expect, but assuming that Provincial Park Directors were not that unlike State Park Directors and there I was in the midst of a very structured, formal meeting, I suppose, like a meeting of parliament or something. All of the papers were written out and formally delivered and I left aghast.

I am not saying that is bad because I was very impressed with the way you all conducted your business, but what did make it sort of bad was that I extended the opportunity to join us at our meeting that year, which happened to be in Lafayette, Louisiana, and that turned out to be quite an exceptional meeting. You have heard of the "lost weekend"; well, we were refer to that as the "lost meeting". It was a very mobile meeting, not to say liquid, but what the host state had done was to arrange for an RV Club to host the group and, every day after an hour or two of sort of perfunctory sessions, we would break up and all join our hosts in their big, luxurious RVs and we would take off on a field trip.

They would start plying us with liquor at that point and, by the end of the day, nobody knew what was going on. By the end of the meeting, everybody was bleery-eyed. So that must have been as much of an eye-opening experience for the delegation that you had. I know that Don Coombes was there and Jim Pottin (ph) and Van Gart (ph) from Ontario. I am not sure what they reported when they got back, but I hope that you do not brand us by reports of that particular meeting. But, anyway, that was my first experience with you.

Since then I have had the pleasure of attending a couple of other meetings, one in Nova Scotia in 1982 and then, of course, our joint meeting in Banff in 1985. As I said, we have learned a great deal from you in the way that you do things and we are very impressed by the Parks, generally, in Canada.

As Charles mentioned, we are hoping that we can arrange for another joint meeting in 1993. I am not sure exactly how that date was selected, maybe Norm had something to do with that, but, since your meeting will be in Ontario, we would like to try to arrange for ours to be in an adjoining state, either Michigan or New York, so that we can have our separate sessions and then join for a joint meeting sometime afterwards. I think that the meeting in Banff was very worthwhile from our standpoint, we hope it was from yours and we look forward to following that up with another joint meeting in 1993.

I can report that state parks south of the border are still alive and reasonably well in spite of some very serious shortfalls of revenue. The northeastern states, particularly, are hard hit by a recession and the parks, as I am sure you all know, are among the first casualties of any revenue shortfall. So, they are struggling, as are some of the states in other parts of the country, but, by and large, we are holding our own through hard work, perseverence, determination and innovation. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the innovation has turned more toward new ways to generate revenue, which is good if they work and you produce revenue, but they may not always be good in terms of some of the sacrifices you have to make in order to institute new revenue programs.

But everything is being tried and that is one of the beauties of our situation. Having fifty states, we have actually fifty laboratories out there to experiment and try just about everything so that we can glean from that those things that do work and discard those that do not.

Our association, I think, has grown stronger and perhaps matured a little bit. We have made significant progress in recent years. We have had excellent leadership. Some of you will remember Bill Walters, our immediate Past President. Bill, of course, left Indiana as State Parks Director there and migrated to Washington as part of the Indiana Mafia. The popular perception is that Bill defected to the National Parks Service, but the truth is that we planted him there so that we now have a mole deep within the bowels of the National Park Service and, hopefully, we can stay a step ahead of them in terms of their scheming. I do not know whether you all have that problem with your federal level or not. Of course, Doug Aikin is doing an outstanding job as our current President.

Some of the things that we are now involved in consist of working on our annual information exchange, which is the compilation of various data from the state parks systems that we put together each year. We have recognized from the outset that it has some shortcomings and we are working now, through a committee that was recently formed, to take a hard, critical look at that exercise, after the ten or twelve years experience that we have gained, and see if we can eliminate some of the problems and strengthen it as a valuable resource document because it is being used a great deal more then we ever anticipated. A lot of people request it and are using it and we recognize that the data are not totally reliable. Socner or later, if it has not already, it is going to result in some embarrassment, so we are trying to work out the flaws there.

We have entered into a partnership arrangement with the National Parks Service and two other national organizations of state officials, the state liaison officers for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program and the state historic preservation officers, generally, to try to develop a more cooperative and mutually supporting role for each of those organizations. We all have similar interests and we all cover much of the same ground. What we would like to do is make it easier on everybody by sharing our ideas and experiences and cooperating with each other. So, that is the main purpose of this partnership, which is still in its infancy, but we hope that, with the support that we are receiving now from the National Park Service, it can accomplish great things for us.

We have also entered into an agreement with the National Parks Service to participate in what they are calling Info Bank, which is a data gathering and cataloguing program using computer technology. We do not know how that is going to work. Right now we are off to a good start. Everybody is trying to cooperate and support it, but you know how those things go after a time. They have a way of kind of falling off, but we are going to try to keep the feet to the fire and make that work because this will attempt to pull together almost every type of information on parks and recreation in related fields in the country. The information will be there to be retrieved and used by each of the participating organizations, including ours.

We are working now to find a university somewhere around the country that might be interested in establishing a center for state parks. We have sent out exploratory letters to, I think, ten universities, initially, where we know they have strong programs in parks and recreation matters, and have already received some positive interest. If that works, we hope that we can get them to take over many of the data gathering and maintenance functions that we are now trying to do through our limited means and also support a number of other research activities and things of that sort. I have no idea at this point which university might be selected.

We have a semi-annual newsletter. I do not know whether you all are on the mailing list or not, but we have recently supplemented that with an occasional bulletin, called "Park Insider", which we put out only as the need arises or as the information is submitted to make it feasible. We have gotten out two issues now that have been well received and I hope that will serve to strengthen communication among the states. I am sure that you all have some problem with your ten provinces. We have an insuperable problem with 50 states and sometimes we wonder if some of them are even part of the nation.

We are going international, or trying to, over and above our participation in your meetings annually. We are developing what you might call an outreach program. We are negotiating with the National Parks Service to conduct a workshop in South America in 1992. I do not know how that will turn out, but we are both optimistic at this point that we can do something that will be of interest to the participating foreign countries better than the National Parks Service can because, really, there are so many countries - third world countries, particularly - that cannot relate at the level of the U.S. National Parks Service and they can better relate to what we are doing at some of the state park levels. So, if this works out, we will prepare a report or a training paper and conduct a workshop on various subjects. If it does work, then perhaps it will be followed up by others. But we are excited about that possibility.

We have had one state park forum last year in Hershey, Pennsylvania to try to carry our message to a broader constituency, other than just talking to each other at our annual meetings. We invited a lot of outsiders, private citizens, as well as government people and organizations. We hope to follow that up with a second forum somewhere in the west later this year if we can find the funding. But that served a very useful purpose.

So, these are just some of the things that we are now engaged in, I think, to at least make our association more useful and worthwhile for the state parks agencies. Now, we have a long way to go, but we are learning and learning a lot from you.

I would like to conclude by simply commending you for what you are doing here in Canada, both at the provincial and the federal level, in preserving and wisely managing your park resources. As I have said before, with the mess that we are making of things south of the border, we are all going to be looking to Canada for our parks experiences in the future, so take good care of what you have and do not mess it up like we have. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ney. I now know why, when we have our Directors' Meetings and the agenda item comes up, "Is anyone attending the U.S. State Park Directors Meeting?", Mr. Richards just silently nods, "Yes, I will be there". Based on the Mississippi or the Missouri Conference, I guess, Norm will be attending many, many more.

We have about ten minutes before coffee break is scheduled. I think I will take the opportunity to hear any questions that you might have.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): That reminds me that we are having our annual meeting in Burlington, Vermont in early September. I would like to invite any or all of you to participate if you are so inclined. We would love to have you there.

CHAIRMAN: Okay, thanks, Ney. If there is further information, I am sure that you can get the dates of that conference from either Charles or myself; we have the agenda, so let us know.

Let us take the opportunity, that being the case where we do have a few extra minutes before coffee, to hear anyone who does have any specific questions for any of the people who presented reports or updates this morning. You all want to go for coffee. Alright.

Ian Rutherford was nodding, when you were talking about the mole situation earlier this morning, with a little bit of chagrin because if, in fact, anything has happened in this country, it has been just the opposite. The provincial agencies have gained by having those moles transplanted from the CPS to the provinces.

If there are no questions, that being the case, let us break early for coffee and be back here at a quarter to eleven so that we can begin the process of the State of the Nation Reports.

Before we do leave, I would just like to make an announcement for the Directors that Arlin Hackman has given us an invitation to be hosted for lunch today, to discuss with him and hear him present some ideas with regard to the World Wildlife Fund and some of the activities that they are undertaking with protected areas. So, I leave that as an invitation from Arlin to the Directors. Could you please, therefore, get back to ArlIn during the break and let him know if you are interested. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: We are now at the point in our agenda dealing with the State of the Nation Reports. These reports are, in fact, quick highlights and summaries from each of the agencies, highlighting and summarizing some of the major activities of the agency during the past year and up to the current activities.

There were blue binders at the registration desk that had the State of the Nation Reports included in them. They are primarily there for the NGOs, the non-government people, because each of the Directors did get a copy. So, if anyone is looking for a report who did not get one, by all means, let Charles or myself know and we will see what we can come up with, should there not be enough there.

I also have for the Directors, available from Charles, copies of the State of the Nation Report from Quebec and the State of the Nation Report from Nova Scotia right here on my table this morning. The Directors can pick those up a little later on. They were not in the binders that you had received earlier.

Again, in terms of the agencies, we do not have a particular presentation, obviously, from Quebec because of the non-attendance here at the conference, but their report is available in the binders that I just mentioned and I believe that it is translated, so feel free to pick it up and analyze it from there.

In terms of the process, the Directors know the order in which they are speaking and I will remind them of this. As this group leaves, another group would come up to the podium. We have ten minutes for each to present a summary of the highlights and I will use the Chairman's prerogative, as you all know in the Directors' Meeting, to let them know when the ten minutes are up so that we can keep on schedule for the whole proceedings.

In terms of ten minutes, what I would like to be able to do is for the Directors to summarize the highlights, the important items, of those reports in four or five or six minutes, therefore, leaving another four or five minutes following that for open discussion with the particular agency who has presented the report.

If everything goes well and on schedule along those lines, after the twelve presentations are made, after lunch, before we get into the workshops, we should then have about a half an hour available for open discussion from the floor for any questions then from any particular agency who presented materials. So, you would get then an opportunity to discuss twice, once with individual, particular questions to the presentee and, again, later on at the full session this afternoon.

Perhaps we can begin. The first presentation, I believe, is British Columbia. I welcome Jake Masselink.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. JAKE MASSELINK, BRITISH COLUMBIA

MR. J. MASSELINK (Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Parks, B.C.): Thank you, Don. As I mentioned, this is my first time in Newfoundland and I find it a very fascinating place. I went up to Signal Hill on Sunday and they have a map there showing St. John's as the center of the universe and I noticed that, when I am here, I am closer to Rome than to home. That puts a rather interesting perspective on the size of our country and it also gives you an opportunity to look at things in perspective from a distance.

State of the Nation Report: This is the Republic of British Columbia coming through. You have three pages in your binders, but I am going to try to summarize some things. It was done about two months ago because Charlie wanted all these things in on time so that he could translate them for this meeting and, of course, with Charlie residing in our office, we met his time line. As you know, in B.C., things are rather in a state of flux and a few other things have happened since then, so I will report on progress.

Two themes have continued to dominate our work: One, of course, to enlarge and improve upon the establishment and protection of our parks and ecological reserve systems and the other in serving our ever increasing users in the best way possible within the limits of our conservation goals.

In a very real sense, both themes grow out of our initiatives to foster, understand and work closely with our shareholders and visitors. We make a distinction, even though our visitors are mostly shareholders, but we look at them in terms of two very distinct clientele, if you like, the shareholders being the residents and owners of our parks system and the visitors, of course, being our customers. Also, in particular, there is a growing public sentiment that parks are a very important part of the social and economic as well as environmental well-being of the province. In B.C., if you do not know this, we feel that, in operating in parks and ecological reserves, we operate in a glass bowl because we have everyone's interest. Everyone is looking over our shoulder, in industry as well as politicians and environmental groups. It has made for a most interesting way to earn your living.

Just to put things into perspective, we are organized into three branches. We are a ministry unto ourselves. We have our own Minister and that throws a different dimension onto things as well. Where as before you were focused on serving the park visitor, you are now also serving a cabinet minister. You are at the Cabinet table and our resources, of course, were not increased, so they are stretched. We have three divisions within our Ministry: Management services, the glue that keeps us together; planning and conservation, the group that brings parks and ecological reserves on stream and is responsible to ensure that things are preserved from one generation to the next, in tact; and visitors services, dealing with anything to do with the visitor who comes to our parks. So, that is the way we are organized and that is the way I am going to sort of summarize our events.

Our budget this year reflects somewhat the public interest in parks and ecological reserves. We had an 11% increase. We have a budget of nearly $37 million and, in addition to that, we have an acquisition budget of $3.7 million and that is up from $2 million. That acquisition budget is to acquire both new parkland, privately-owned land, as well as mineral claims. We have a policy in B.C. of expropriating all claims within parks. We are in court with multimillion dollar suits right now. Two companies have taken us to court so far and the damages that they are going for total about $150 million. But we have something like 356 claims to acquire yet. In the last three years, I think we have knocked off something like 200 of them. Of course, they are the easy ones. The tough ones are now on the books to be taken care of.

Let us look at planning and conservation. We have a new Minister, our eighth in ten years, who has taken a real interest in what we are about. He was a developer. When we told him what we were all about and we gave him a tour of the province and set up meetings with him in various communities, he turned around to us later on and he said, "You know, I never knew this about you. I always thought you were tree-huggers, but you are well-balanced and you could make a contribution to the rest of the province that none of us have realized." So, he has become a very effective spokesman for us in Cabinet and I just hope that we keep him for a little while.

Since the document that you have was printed, he has announced plan 90. I think that all of the Directors here have probably received that document, and what that really addresses is a process of park planning to develop a process for planning the parks system. It consists of striking the balance, i.e. our third addition of our parks policy. It includes a document on the landscapes of B.C. Parks. There are 59 landscapes that we want to see represented within our parks system, based on geophysical and biogeoclimatic criteria. There is a document on special natural features of B.C. by various categories that we want to see included in either the ecological reserves program or the parks program and then there is a summary of the parks planning process and a timetable to develop that process with full public participation.

Now, the interesting thing is that we are not just working with environmental groups. The people who are most interested in seeing this process in place are the forest industry and the mining industry because of the tremendous pressure that they are under, i.e. wherever they find a tree to log, they find tree-huggers or, wherever they find a claim to mine, they find people who are concerned about acid-mine drainage, etc. So, I think that the environment is ripe in B.C. to work towards a systems plan.

I guess I am just about out of my time here, Mr. Chairman. The other thing that I wanted to highlight is that the Parks Act has just been amended and 23 new parks had their boundaries legislated within the Act. We now have 102 parks with legislated boundaries. That represents 80% of our land base. The policy with us right now is that, as we develop a master plan with full public participation and get it approved, it then gets put on the register for an amendment to the Parks Act when the next legislature sits to be then incorporated into the Parks Act. So, I think that that is quite an achievement.

We have also revised completely our park regulations so that they are much more readable and a little less officious than they were before.

The other thing that I wanted to also bring to your attention is Carmana(ph). Talk about value added. We are all talking about how, in provinces that rely on primary industries, you can add value for economic benefit. Well, the environmentalists picked up on this, found a big spruce tree and said that they added value. They said that it was as big as the Peace Tower in Ottawa and now it became a national symbol. Well, the lower part of Carmana Valley, because of its big citrus spruce, is going to be legislated as a park. I phoned yesterday to see how far they had progressed. It is the Minister of Forests who is introducing the legislation and donating to us a park. It has received second reading, but third reading has not taken place yet. So that is on the conservation side.

Very briefly, on the visitors services side, we had a million increase in visitation last year. We are now up to 20.5 million annually without very much of a capital increase in budget, but our resources are stretched. The other thing that I wanted to highlight is the privatization program that our government introduced three years ago. At that time, every Ministry and every program in government was asked to come forward with privatization initiatives. Those initiatives were then put in place, usually by a government-appointed, task-force team. We were ready for them and it was our district managers who unanimously said, "We have a plan to contract out all of our services and we will do it within three years on the condition that we manage our affairs."

And the government bought that and, in June of this year, we contracted out our last park facility. So, every park facility in B.C. is operated under contract, two-year contracts with a rollover of another three if the performance is satisfactory. All of our interpretive programs are contracted. And that fits with the government's policy that government's role is really there to direct, develop and manage programs, but that the private sector should be used wherever possible to deliver. And we are now through phase 1. We are not out of the woods by a long shot, I am sure. Phase 2 will, I am sure, be most interesting, as we proceed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Jake. We have time for one quick question for Jake. If you do have a question, please use one of the mikes. Alan Appleby.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): The initiative that you have undertaken on privatization is obviously a big one and probably one that many of us may be facing or may have already faced. I just wonder if you can give us a little more information in terms of the types of contracts. Surely, in all of that, you are still putting money into these contracts. Some of these people can make money, some of them cannot; are you subsidizing, etc.? What is the sort of general nature of the situation and what kind of success have you had? Are you getting a lot of rollover of contractors and is there a problem in getting consistency, meeting standards and getting continuity throughout the years?

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): That is why I was saying that phase 1 of the program has just been completed. Now, what happens as we carry on? We contract out all design, all construction and a lot of our planning. Anything that you can package as a project is contracted. At Expo '86, for instance, that was when we really got going. Our public information at Expo was under contract and it received more inquiries than across the way where Tourism had their staff managing a booth. Those are the kind of people who would cultivate it to develop our interpretive program. It takes a lot of work to cultivate people.

"How is it looking?" We have about a 30% reduction in costs, very roughly estimated. On the other hand, when you look at what we are going through in B.C., we are spending an awful lot more time in public involvement. No matter what we do or touch, the public is involved. The number of letters, for instance, that are written to the Minister has increased, I think, from about a thousand a year to something like five thousand a year now. A great deal of time now goes into dealing with the public and all sectors of the public.

The environmental issues in B.C. are major as are the native rights issues. We have a lot of native groups now coming forward and saying, "That park is in our land-claims area. We will manage it, thank you very much, it is ours." Those kinds of things take a lot of time, but we now have the time to address them, so that is a benefit as well. We have good contractors and very few have failed us.

However, we have cut some off. We do regular inspections and give a written report right there to the contractor telling him what he is doing well and what he is not doing well. We undertake visitor-satisfaction surveys, which we have done for a number of years, so we know what level of satisfaction we expect the park to be managed at. And so that becomes a check.

Those are some of the safeguards that we have put in place. However, we also found that, in the first batch of contracts that we had signed, the contractors realized that they had cut themselves a little short. As they renew, that cost will increase. A major downsize is that, when you are on contract like we are, where before 65 to 70% of our operating costs were in wages, we are down to about 40 to 45% now, but our flexibility has gone. You cannot lay staff off early in the season and save a few dollars to fix things. You cannot reassign staff.

So, you no longer have to worry about toilets and tables and garbage and firewood and all of those mundane things, but, on the other hand, you no longer have the flexibility to do things. So, that is a drawback.

Generally, I would say that we are fairly, fairly pleased with efforts to date. I expect that the pendulum may swing back. We probably will pick up some things that we are going to manage ourselves. We can focus a lot more attention in the back country, the wilderness, and much more on resource management that we could not do before.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Jake. Perhaps now we can go on to Manitoba. And I will call on Gordon Prouse.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. GORDON PROUSE, MANITOBA

MR. G. PROUSE (Director of Parks, Manitoba): Thanks, Don. This is a bit of a new format for us as a group of Directors with respect to presenting State of the Nation Reports. In recent times anyway, this is the first time that it has been part of the formal conference program. So, this is your opportunity as a group to do some comparative shopping. You have the heads of all parks agencies in front of you, so I would encourage you to take the opportunity to challenge us, either on what we have done or what we have not done. Please ask questions either after each presentation or at the end.

With respect to Manitoba's State of the Nation Report, I am just going to highlight a few of the points that are in the printed paper. For the five-year period 1984-88, we had experienced a fairly steady but slow increase in park use. In 1989, we had a dramatic change take place and I would just like to reference some of our preliminary, transient-camper statistics. Overall, our camper unit days were down about 15%, but, when we look at it regionally, there is a telling story. In the Northwest Region, we had a decrease of almost 33%; in the Interlake Region, we had a decrease of about 24%; and in the Northeast Region, it was around 20%.

I think that we can attribute this to forest fires; 1989 was a terrible year in Manitoba for fires. So, not only did we find some of the access roads to our parks closed, but I think that the atmosphere that was created by concern over fires decreased the amount of use even when the fires were not burning in that particular area. So, climatic conditions can have a pretty significant impact in terms of Manitoba parks.

Premier Filmon hosted the official camping kick-off in support of the Manitoba Wilderness Caucuses Promotion of the World Wildlife Fund Endangered Spaces Campaign and, in his speech, he outlined a mechanism to guide park management for the future in Manitoba. And I would just like to quote some of the things that he said.

> "While the present Parks Act has guided the establishment and development of parks over the years, new demands on the environment and our economy and a new public awareness of environmental concerns dictate that the present Act should be reviewed and the principles of sustainable development enshrined.
>
> A discussion paper will be developed and wide public review will be initiated in the formulation of a new Parklands Act to guide park management into the next century. A systems plan for Manitoba's parks was completed in 1985. This plan is a guide for the management of existing parks and the creation of new ones, especially in those natural regions of Manitoba which are not yet represented. We will demonstrate our commitment by updating the systems plan and having it reviewed and approved by Cabinet."

Now, we cannot get a much higher commitment than that of the Premier making those kinds of statements, so I would see us being very busy over the next year trying to move in those directions that he provided us.

There is a new forest products company on the scene in Manitoba and it is called REPAP; coincidentally, that is paper spelled backwards. It has been allocated cutting rights to a fairly significant area of the province and, as such, the new Environment Act requires that public hearings take place on logging plans, which is a new experience for Manitobans. It has also been a new experience for the Parks Branch because this is the first time that we have been invited to participate and we played an active role in the review of their logging plans. I would attribute this invitation to the fact that we restructured the branch a year ago and we created a regional management component where we placed regional park managers in the various regional centers to be active participants in decision making on resource allocation issues. And so we were able to participate this time.

Another significant event had occurred surrounding REPAP's review. This was the first time that our systems plan was employed as a management tool. It was referenced with respect to a paper that the logging company had to entertain and it was used as a management document. So, systems plans do have a very practical role to play.

I would like to talk a little bit about Grand Beach, which is a very unique park in Manitoba's system. It is a high-use park, basically used by people who are in the age group of 18 to 25 years of age, and, on a hot summer weekend, we will have 30,000 plus on the three-kilometer stretch of beautiful sandy beach on the south end of Lake Winnipeg.

Now, corporations and various event-organizers who target this age group wanted to use the summer weekends and it was a bit chaotic. We would have two or three large events taking place at the same time, attracting far more people than the park is capable of handling and, at times, there were some undesirable events taking place as well. So, we decided that we would tender the summer weekends for special events and we called for proposals. We received a number of them and were able to spread the use out over the summer period. We were able to select events that were more compatible with the park itself and I think that we provided a better recreational experience for users and we had an opportunity of working much more closely with our Tourism group as well.

We have just completed a marketing strategy to better match park offerings to public needs. The first stage was an initial analysis and research phase and it involved conducting a number of surveys. So, I would like to highlight some of the significant results of those surveys and I would also like to turn the results into some practical application. We had an opportunity to present to our Minister the results of these surveys and I must say that he was very interested and took some of the interesting results forward to his cabinet colleagues.

I will start with the visitors survey, which is a survey of all the park visitors that we have every two years. Something that came out of it was that they were very, very dissatisfied with the condition of the roads in Manitoba parks. We mentioned this to the Minister and this year we have $500,000.00 of brand new money to fix roads in parks. Roads are very high-profile and you get a nice pat on the back when the road is nice.

We conducted a cottagers survey. In Manitoba, we have about 6,000 cottages in provincial parks and we sort of operate as a small municipality in administering them. We found out that the average age of our cottager was 56 years of age and that they had owned cottages for 18 years. Right now, we are facing what we call a permanent residency problem in parks where we are seeing people who have used parks for the summer period in the past and now want to live there all year round. Some of them will visit Florida during the winter season, but, in the summer, they will come back and they will live in a provincial park, but we do not have the infrastructure to handle that. This tells us that, if they are 56 years of age, we are getting awfully close to having a lot more of them start to show up in parks, so we have to do something about that.

We also found out that there are 29,000 cottagers on an average summer weekend who use provincial parks and 8,000 in the winter, which is far more use in provincial parks on a winter weekend than we expected. So, it helps us in terms of timing of road maintenance and those kinds of things. Also, half of them use the lake as their main source of water. So, very clearly, we have to be conscious of environmental concerns.

We did a focus group testing in some particular regions of the province and we wanted to find out what experiences or images people had when they visited parks. So, we looked at users and non-users. Well, the company that we employed to find non-users spent ten hours on the phone and they could not come up with fifteen non-users of parks in Manitoba, which means that just about every Manitoban, at some time, visits a park.

So, we went to infrequent users. We had a good cross-section, from teenagers to seniors, seasonal transient campers, cottagers, back-country users, day users, etc., and most of them, when they talked about a park (I am speaking of the users) talk about a peaceful place where it is calm with clean air, water, trees and wildlife. Often, they will relate an experience that is in the early morning over a completely calm lake that is misty or they will relate an experience at night with the moonlight shining on a completely calm lake. So, with that, that is the kind of image that we will portray when we are trying to produce products to attract people to parks. They also said very clearly that they hated motor boats and the noise of motor boats even though many of them own motor boats and water ski, etc., so you do not put a motor boat on the front of a park advertisement, that is for sure.

The non-users were pretty interesting. Some of them were new Canadians and, when asked what their image was of parks, they could not tell you. They did not have an image. And those who did have an image or those who did use parks infrequently would use two parks, Bird's Hill and Grand Beach. So, if we are going to target those people, we will go to Bird's Hill and Grand Beach and we will also go to the ethnic centers and make sure that they have some information on parks so that they can get a vision themselves and go and visit it.

The ones who did use parks indicated that they went there - and this was a very interesting statement - because of freedom and open spaces.

So, with that, I will close and thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Gordon. We are losing a little bit of time and I am concerned that we may not have too much time later on this afternoon, so I will go on to the next speaker, that being the case. Any questions that you may have can be addressed to Gord at lunchtime or, certainly, later on this afternoon.

I call on Ontario, Norm Richards.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. NORMAN RICHARDS, ONTARIO

MR. N. RICHARDS (Director, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ontario): Thanks, Don. Just before I start, I would like to quickly introduce two staff members from Ontario, Ken McCleary, our Manager of Planning and Development, as well as a new member, a person who was in the Parks Program many years ago and who has taken on a new task now, Jack Van der Meer, our new Manager of Environmental Assessment and Legislation Review.

The past year in Ontario has really been a year of anticipation, mainly from a human-resources-management point of view. Within the Ministry of Natural Resources, we have been going through several reviews and I guess the first thrust has been the preparation of a vision or a strategic direction to take us through the 90's for the whole Ministry. We are very caught up with that phrase, "the greening of the province", from all programs' point of view, whether it is Forestry, Lands and Water, Fish and Wildlife or the Provincial Parks Program. There is a strong emphasis by all programs on sustainable development. We have been able to make it very clear from Parks point of view that sustainable development does seriously involve, in a very important way, the Parks Program as a cornerstone for that concept. Within our Ministry, that is a major step forward. We are seeing other programs, as well as our Minister and senior staff, take a much more serious look at the protection objective than we ever have before.

We have also been going through a major organization review and the first-stage announcment will be coming out on July 31st so, from a human-resources-planning or management point of view, you can imagine the anticipation that is going on with people sitting on the edge of their seats wondering what is going to happen. We are predicting that there will be an expanded role for the Parks Branch out of this announcement on July 31st and it will probably be more in the area of natural heritage and concentrating more on what we are doing for protecting private lands throughout the province.

A major announcement, as part of reorganization, was made just a week ago and, when you live in Toronto and you work in Toronto, this is really a major announcement. The government has determined that the Ministry of Natural Resources' main office staff will be moving out of Toronto, 500 staff people going to Peterborough, I guess an hour-and-a-half drive away, and 200 staff people going to Haileybury. Now, when this was announced, several of the 700 staff members really did not know where Haileybury was; it is 500 kilometers north of Toronto and an hour and a half to two hours north of Sudbury. The main reason behind this move is job creation in these smaller communities. It is an efficiency strategy because the costs of office space and accommodation space in Toronto are rising quickly. It is a chance for us to attract really good field people to come and work in main office, something that has been a real problem from a real-estate point of view, and this is going to be helpful.

The staff reaction to date is generally favourable. Many people see it as an opportunity to get out of the big city and to get away from the inconvenience of commuting. They also want to take advantage of real estate investments. There are negatives. Some staff are very concerned because of the good jobs that some of their spouses do hold. So, we have some important decisions to make. This program will be phased in over a four-year period of time.

There are some major special projects. I mentioned the appointment of Jack Van der Meer as our Manager of Environmental Assessment and Legislation Review. This is a program that we have been doing some work on for a few years. You have probably heard of our Timber Class Environmental Assessment within the Ministry of Natural Resources, which has been proceeding for a number of years. We are going to go through the same thing over the next three to four years for the Parks Program. It is very time consuming and very costly and we are watching very closely what is happening with the timber class environmental assessment at the present time.

In regard to legislative review, you all know that, a few years ago, we did implement a new provincial parks policy which takes us closer to the protection objective in many ways and we are trying, through the legislative review process for our Provincial Parks Act, to enshrine those new protection-oriented, provincial park policies. At the same time, we are preparing a White Paper now for an Ecological Reserves Act which will give even more special status to nature reserves as ecological reserves in the province.

We have spent a lot of time trying to meet the challenge of the Endangered Spaces Campaign and trying to complete our parks system. We are trying to complete what we call a protection strategy, right now, which will outline exactly how we can complete our parks and protected areas system by the year 2000. A major effort, right now, is to try to announce a few more new provincial parks in 1993, which is our Parks Centennial for Ontario.

We are continuing our major parks revitalization program. We will be spending $8 million this year and we have started with the turning-of-the-sod ceremony on June 28th for a new visitors center in Algonquin Park which, over the next three years, will probably reach a $10 million figure. It is 26,000 square feet in size and we really feel that, for an internationally recognized park, this is well worth the investment.

We are spending more and more time in that area of natural heritage outside of provincial parks, especially with private landowners. This is an unbelievable task. We realize, in trying to meet the challenge of completing the parks system, that we cannot do it by simply buying or expropriating private lands. We have to enter into several different kinds or levels of agreements with private landowners. We implemented during the last year a Conservation Lands Tax Rebate Program. At the present time, just after one year, we have 3,400 private landowners involved. We expect that, within the next year or two, that will rise to 10,000 private landowners, protecting over 100,000 hectares. And we will be giving out, within the next two years, over $10 million a year in tax rebates to private landowners, protecting wetlands or areas of natural and scientific interest.

We are working very closely with the Natural Heritage League, a group of 31 government and non-government organizations working closely together to secure natural areas in the province. The major project, right now, is a review of the Municipal Planning Act and we are calling that exercise a greening of the Planning Act.

The last item that I wanted to mention is one that I have already briefly talked about, i. e. the Parks Centennial. I guess the latest fad is to take full advantage of celebrating everything and anything. And if we have a gimmick right now, it is our Parks Centennial and we are using it. I have talked about the revitalization program. There is a lot more funding coming forward for upgrading the parks systems' new facilities as we move to the year 1993. We have really started a three-year, kick-off campaign with the turning-of-the-sod ceremony of the visitors center in Algonquin Park. We want to get the field staff more and more involved. We want to get the public involved.

We are getting our field staff together in September for a Parks Superintendents Conference. There will be probably close to 200 people attending that. The theme of that will be Environmental Awareness. In the past, we have always talked about operational themes. Now, through the parks superintendents, we are going to have some serious discussions about the greening of the province. We are continuing our close relationships with outside groups in organizing that conference. Monte Hummel, from the World Wildlife Fund, will be our kick-off speaker, talking about the Endangered Spaces Program. Ney Landrum is coming representing both the U.S. National System and the State Parks System to give us up-to-date trends and to tell us what the environmental challenges are that park managers are facing south of the border. We also have our Regional Director General, Jane Rozelle, from the National Parks System in Cornwall. She represents the Ontario Region and she will be participating with us too.

The last item in conjuntion with the Centennial will be, hopefully, a joint Federal-Provincial Parks Council Meeting with the Association of State Park Directors. Mr. Ney Landrum has already identified it. That will probably be in Niagara Falls or Windsor in 1993 and we just want to clarify one point. If it is not Niagara Falls, as part of an initiation to come to Ontario, you do not have to go over the falls in a kayak. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Norm. I would now like to call upon the Yukon, Ian Robertson, please.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. IAN ROBERTSON, YUKON

MR. I. ROBERTSON (Director, Parks Resources and Regional Planning, Department of Renewable Resources, Yukon): Before I begin, I would just like to make a brief comment. I had a chance to read the progress report on the Endangered Space Campaign and I realized that the Yukon has not been doing very well when I officially got demoted from a Director to a Chief, as a results of the activity.

We like to think in Yukon that we are in a parks and tourism business and, like any good business, we need to have a clear focus, a desirable product and a practical business plan. During the last year we did set a clear vision and this is the vision for which we are trying to get cabinet approval. It is very specific, a diversified parks and outdoor recreation system by 1998 to celebrate a century of achievement. We do have a business plan under development. Our parks policy has draft cabinet approval, we have completed a public review and we expect the final approval to be received by December. We are in the process of developing systems plans for our parks as well as for the art outdoor recreation for our Heritage Rivers and for our campground system redevelopment. All those are in draft stages at the present time and they too will be finished by December.

Like other jurisdictions, we are preoccupied with revenue generation and recapitalization. This is one of the reasons for the campground-system redevelopment plan. We have 53 campground and day-use areas and only one territorial park.

Some of those initiatives that, hopefully, will help us out on the dollars and cents side include the use of self-registration. That program has been working very well with our out-of-territory visitors, particularly, our American counterparts who are used to this approach. However, Yukoners themselves have an attitude that they should not have to pay for anything and I am not quite sure how we will get by that one.

We have managed to build two bridges using somewhat of an unusual approach in that we managed to access Transportation Department funding and, believe it or not, our Transportation people built those bridges about 30% cheaper than private enterprise. So, that ought to be a first.

In our Mergers and Acquisitions Department, we would like to think that we have had some success. Our Herschel Island Management Plan is just about complete. Most of you probably do not realize that this new park was established as a result of the Inuviallet(ph) Land Claim Agreement in the Western Arctic. As part of that land claim, there is a requirement for participatory management structure and, to date, we have had some success in that area.

On the Yukon River, we should have our nomination and our management plan finished for the 30-mile section for a formal designation in January of 1991 on schedule. That has been quite a problem during the past year because we are in the middle of a major land claim negotiation and it is very hard to move on initiatives, such as new parks, when they are a pawn in the negotiation for much bigger issues. We have hit several roadblocks which we have managed to overcome. This is a joint initiative of the local band, the Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs with some cooperative assistance through the Canadian Parks Service.

We have several other successes that I think we can announce. In particular, we would like to announce that Cold River Springs will be our first ecological reserve and we have been able, through the financial assistance of the Nature Conservancy of Canada and Foothills Pipelines of the Yukon, to come up with the funding necessary to finalize that project. We should be announcing the formal establishment of our first ecological reserve this September.

We are also quite conscious of our image and, to that end, we have started to look at some careful interdepartmental forms of cooperation on things like rest stops. So, with our Department of Transportation and our Department of Tourism, we are attempting to develop a new program that will look not only at the capital costs of site development, the opportunities for wildlife viewing, but also at the ongoing maintenance costs and headaches that you get. Just as a simple example, regarding the whole garbage problem, there is an image of the Yukon as a wilderness and clean area, but yet there is a significant garbage problem.

We have had some interesting successes. A good example is a joint venture on a campground host program. Ironically, of the 2,000 people who have expressed interest in becoming campground hosts, 98% of them are from the United States.

The last thing that I would mention is in the area of land claims. In the Yukon land claim, we have a draft settlement in terms of the overall claim; however, there will be formal band-by-band negotiations to follow and, under the overall claim, there are several important provisions. One is a specific clause on special management areas which cover the establishment of new parks; the second one is a guaranteed right of participation in site selection, planning and ongoing management; and the third factor is a requirement that they always have the option to preserve traditional activities.

So, in closing, the reality is that we are doing more with less. This will mean some facility closures during the next year or so because we cannot do it all. It will mean more privatization and greater public participation. Thank you.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Wayne. Before these four speakers leave, I am going to give you an opportunity for a couple of short questions before I call upon a couple of other provinces to come up. So, are there any questions that you might have with regard to the presentations?

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): I just have a quick one for Gordon. You mentioned these 5,800 cottagers in your parks; are these private inholdings or are they using park cottages?

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): These are a combination of private landowners; there are not that many private landholdings within parks. They are primarily leased cottages on parkland. We do not own the cottages, the cottagers construct the cottages themselves. We just lease the land out to them.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): So, do 5,800 cottagers represent 5,800 cottages?

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): No.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Or just the use of. . .

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): There are 5,800 cottages, you are right. There are far more than 5,800 cottagers; there are 5,800 owners.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): 5,800 separate constructors?

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): Right.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: There is time for another question. Gary Sealy.

MR. G. SEALY: Maybe you are not prepared to answer it, but my question is really to all the analysts and it is based on a background report which identifies 35 professors teaching parks and recreational courses across the country. So, I would like to take just a quick leap out of Ney's book and ask if you Directors would be willing to table your reports, including your statistical reports and maybe even marketing studies like Gordon's, with these professors across the country, who are hungry for information on parks and recreation?

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, as Chairman, I might respond to that on behalf of all the others. Those reports, I believe, are available and the new format that we have produced, in terms of what Saskatchewan has worked on, is much more simplified with readily available information. It is clear and easy to read and it is my understanding that the intent is, in fact, to have those things available. Certainly, the State of the Nation Reports, as we have here today, are.

Does anyone else want another comment on that? Yes, Gordon.

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): Just in respect, Gary, to your question about the marketing surveys, we would certainly make the results of our marketing surveys available to people who are interested.

CHAIRMAN: One further question. Wayne Burley had his hand up.

MR. W. BURLEY (New Brunswick): Yes, I would like to direct this question to Norm and it is regarding the initiative with the protection of private land and the legal implications. Is your branch responsible for what, I would assume, would be legal agreements with each of these landowners? And, if so, how are you able to handle the sheer size of the numbers of agreements that you must have, based on what you have told us, as far as the number of landowners who are interested in this program?

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): We are still in our infancy with respect to all the different kinds of mechanisms of securing lands other than fee simple and some of the more detailed legal agreements we really have not gone into yet. I guess there are three or four examples of where the Ministry has entered into conservation easements with the people to protect their lands. In regard to the specific program I was talking about with respect to the Conservation Lands Tax Rebate Program, to be eligible to receive that tax rebate, you have to sign a certificate which more or less commits you to protecting those lands. If you decide to change, then you have to notify us and you are struck from the register and you no longer receive that tax rebate.

It is something that is maybe just a little bit more than a gentleman's agreement, but it is probably the lowest level of protection that we can buy at this time and we feel, on the other hand, that it may be the only and the highest level of protection that we may ever be able to get for those pieces of land. I guess the surprising point right now is the great number of private landowners who are coming forward. The only concern is that, initially, some of them had the misinformation that there was some legally binding condition that would be carried on their deed and there is no such thing; it is strictly a cooperative thing.

CHAIRMAN: One of the other panelists would like to make a comment to Gary's response; or is it a question? Jake.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Yes, Gary, that was in response to whether our studies and reports, etc. are available for public distribution. Absolutely, but with one proviso. In a gathering like this, it is important to air this. We are in the parks business with a sincere desire and commitment to see our provincial parks, our national parks and ecological reserves being properly designated and managed for present and future generations.

But what you find is that some of the things that we come up with will be used against us. In other words, it will be used by others to feed their agendas and I will name you an example, i.e. satisfaction surveys of our customers that we undertake. While we were going through this privatization program of three years, there was no way that the NDP opposition was going to get a copy of that or anyone else who did not believe in what we were doing. But now that it is out, whenever we are finished, we will share that. It is unfortunate that you have to safeguard the tack that you are on until you are far enough along. In the same way, we also withhold other material intentionally for awhile. That is a judgment call on our part.

CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon four more agencies, Nova Scotia, Alberta, New Brunswick and the Canadian Parks Service.

We have 35 minutes before we are scheduled to eat. If at all possible, I would like to finish those four presentations and it would certainly give us a good opportunity to have that half-an-hour, open discussion later on.

Perhaps I can begin by calling on Nova Scotia, Barry Diamond.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. BARRY DIAMOND, NOVA SCOTIA

MR. B. DIAMOND (Director of Parks and Recreation, Department of Lands and Forests, Parks Division, Nova Scotia): Thank you, Don. Ladies and gentlemen. I begin by echoing some of the comments of others about how pleased I am to be here in Newfoundland to enjoy the hospitality of the host province and, of course, the beauty of the province.

As Don indicated earlier, for those of you who do not have a copy of our report, there are copies available and I want you to know that that is part of a strategy to avoid the pitfall that Jake fell into, i.e. having to update the State of the Nation Report when I stand before you.

During the year since the last Federal-Provincial Parks Conference, Nova Scotia's Provincial Parks Program has continued to expand and improve due in large measure to the ongoing implementation of the 1988 parks policy and associated legislation. But, at the same time, the system is facing stresses that relate to high public expectations, limited resources with which to meet expanded program needs and ongoing restraint, especially in the area of operations and maintenance. So, there is positive and negative things to report.

Under the heading of capital improvements, over the past year, we worked on approximately 50 capital projects and had a total budget for capital improvements in the order of $2 million. In the report, a number of those projects are highlighted. The names of the parks involved, perhaps, will not mean a lot to some of you, but it is significant to note that we are expanding our system through the development of new campgrounds and a major new destination park in the Halifax-Dartmouth area.

We are improving some of our existing parks by the addition of new facilities and we have a major new park which has just been initiated on the south shore of the province which involves some rather scenic landscapes and coastal areas. So, there are some exciting new initiatives which are being carried out in that area.

Under the general heading of "Planning" in the paper, I have indicated a number of initiatives which are worthy of note. Our planning staff is doing quite a bit of work on the Heritage Rivers Program for Nova Scotia, a systems planning for a representative system of parks and protected areas, master planning and public consultation associated with that for the park on the south shore of the province, which is Sandy Bay, and strategic planning for policy implementation. In that regard, I would like to point out that Dale Smith, over the past year, travelled to Manitoba and Saskatchewan for the purpose of looking at their systems and the way they are organized and how they deliver their programs. The cooperation of those two agencies is very much appreciated.

It was pointed out earlier - again, I think by Jake - that there has been a tremendous increase in correspondence relative to parks in B.C. and I would make the same comment about the parks system in Nova Scotia. We are noticing a growing interest by the public and a growing expectation on the part of the public with respect to our system and that is becoming evident through the volume of correspondence that we have to deal with. It is a major area of work for us, as it is in B.C.

With respect to parks systems planning, I am pleased to report that progress is being made toward the preparation of a systems plan to establish targets for natural-areas protection and to identify candidate sites. Specifically, funding has been provided for a resource planner and two seasonal support staff to proceed with work on the inventory and evaluation of significant natural areas and features of the province, with emphasis on Crown lands, and this is in order to document the occurrence and significance of unprotected sites.

In addition, the Nova Scotia Museum and the Department of Lands and Forests are working towards an updating and refinement of the natural history of Nova Scotia as a basic systems planning tool. In this regard, the Department of Lands and Forests is supporting the initiative through the secondment of several student positions to the Nova Scotia Museum. So, as I say, there is some important progress being made and this is more fully recorded in an appendix to the report.

In a Parks Day Address, our Minister of Lands and Forests, the Honourable Chuck MacNeil, outlined the steps which would be taken to implement a parks and protected-areas systems planning process in Nova Scotia and he expressed his expectation that, by early 1993, a comprehensive list of candidate parks and protected areas on Crown land will be completed. This will form the basis of a parks and protected-areas systems plan in Nova Scotia.

I mentioned earlier that we were working on the Canadian Heritage Rivers Program in Nova Scotia and, after doing a systems study, we focused on the river in Nova Scotia, the Margaree, which had the greatest potential for nomination to the Canadian Heritage Rivers Program, and carried out a public consultations process over this past winter. The report of the Advisory Committee that was appointed to provide recommendations on the participation of Nova Scotia through the nomination of the Margaree has now been received by the Minister and has been released publicly. At this stage, a decision has not been taken regarding the nomination as there has been some controversy, but I am happy to report that, at least, the process has gone that far and I am optimistic that it will result in a nomination.

As other agencies did, we participated in Parks Day in Nova Scotia and provided a number of opportunities for people to participate in various activities, nature walks and so on. Our Minister was active in a tour on that day and he officially opened a couple of new facilities in different parks and he addressed the inaugural meeting of the Federation of Nova Scotia Naturalists. I earlier referred to some of the contents of his remarks at that address. So, we were pleased to have been able to provide those kinds of activities on that day.

With respect to visitation to our parks, unfortunately, we do not have good figures on our day-use parks, but we did report a 7% increase in registrations at our provincial campgrounds last year which is, of course, encouraging. However, I understand, from some of the preliminary feedback, that things may not be as good this year, but, at least, we did see an increase last year.

With respect to interpretive programs, many of you will perhaps realize that we do not have interpreters on staff in our provincial parks, but we have, over the years, developed a program through which we use people with expertise in other government departments and other sections within our own department as well as volunteers to provide interpretive programs as well as recreational programs in our parks. We have developed a fairly extensive program and the information on it is contained in a brochure. I bring this to your attention because it has kind of developed slowly over several years and has received a lot of attention and support, particularly this year. It has been a worthwhile exercise and one which is paying dividends.

I see that my time has gone so, on the advice of the Chairman, I will close. One sort of concluding comment is that, in reference to a policy implementation, we are providing a lot of new facilities now in our parks, not only in the new ones, but in the existing ones, so we are upgrading the level of service and facility that we are providing in the parks.

As I said, there are a lot of positive things and some negatives that relate to the operation of the parks, but, on balance, things are not that bad in Nova Scotia. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Barry. I would now like to call upon Gerry Tranter from the Province of Alberta.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. GERRY TRANTER, ALBERTA

MR. G. TRANTER (A/Assistant Deputy Minister, Alberta Recreation and Parks, Standard Life Center, Alberta): Thank you very much, Don. This past year in Alberta has been a year of great change in the Parks Service and I will explain some of those changes as I go through my address.

To start off with, though, the Provncial Parks Service in Alberta is responsible for the operation of 61 provincial parks, 46 recreation areas, 3 wilderness areas and, at the time of the writing of this report, 11 ecological reserves. I am pleased to advise that, two weeks ago, number 12 ecological reserve in Alberta was announced by the Minister and I will give you a little more information on that as I go along.

In the 1989-90 fiscal year, the Provincial Parks Service entertained over 1.3 million campers and 6.1 million individual day users. This is a 7.7% decrease in campers over the previous season and a 6.3% increase in day users. A suggested rationale for some of the decrease in camping has to do with the fees that we have increased in the last two years together with the fact that the Alberta Forest Service and the Alberta Department of Transportation or Highways provides very similar services at no charge at all at the present time. So, we are in conflict with two of our other departments in this regard.

The total capital and operating budget of $45.8 million was split between the Provincial Parks Service and Kananaskis country, representing a decrease of 1.7% from the previous fiscal year. The breakdown of that capital budget is contained in the report, which I will not go through.

In new initiatives, the Alberta Provincial Parks Service has, over the past year, undertaken two new initiatives: (1) the creation of a new provincial park and recreation area in Northeastern Alberta out of Lac la Biche and (2) the decentralization and downsizing of the headquarters function of the organization.

The Lakeland Provincial Park and Recreation area, the new area I speak of, is approximately 300 kilometers northeast of Edmonton and has long been known for its recreational potential for fishing, hiking, boating and beach activities as well as hunting, snowmobiling and off-highway vehicle use. The total land area involved in this proposal is 58,857 hectares or, for those of you who are like me and have not converted yet, 145,000 acres.

The area will be developed for both intensive and extensive activities and will become a high-quality, major, tourism destination area within our program. Development plans are scheduled over an eight-year period with an estimated total of $20 million for capital development. Major developments, such as resorts and golf courses, will be built and operated by the private sector.

The restructuring of the Provincial Parks Service, which brought me into Edmonton and into this position as an acting Assistant Deputy Minister over the last year, actually commenced last spring when the new Minister came on stream. It was to be done in three to six months and was, basically, completed here at the 1st of June, not an exercise that I would recommend, and that is one reason why I am still an acting and I am going back to the job I was hired to do as the Director of the Northern Alberta Parks Service. It is much easier on the stress levels.

Many functions previously performed in head office, such as capital development, park level planning and land disposition management, will be decentralized to the field. The headquarters function will be reduced from a complement of 103 persons to 34 persons. As well as the decentralization of some headquarter functions, the Alberta Parks Service is increasing the responsibility for delivery of service closer to the users of those services through district offices.

With respect to volunteers in parks, Parks Day was an excellent example of the volunteers use in parks in the Alberta program this last year. In addition to that, parks have used volunteers increasingly over the past number of years and, to this end, we now offer additional information and client services in 28 parks through our volunteer campground host program as well as using volunteers in other aspects of service delivery, such as interpretive services, assisting with trail construction and maintenance and resource-management inventory studies.

In the field of environmental education, we have now prepared learning resource manuals for 30 of the parks in our system. These manuals are sold to educators to be used as a resource in utilizing parks as outdoor classrooms. The manuals and a series of five natural-region posters and the manual on the posters are sold through a revolving account whereby the revenue is used to reprint manuals and posters to develop new products.

In regard to ecological reserves, as I said, we had 11 reserves up to two weeks ago when the 12th one was announced. The Ecological Reserve Program is overseen by an Advisory Committee which was reappointed by the Minister of Recreation and Parks, the Honourable Dr. Stephen C. West, and this committee has recommended to the Minister the addition of the new site, and that was approved by Cabinet two weeks ago. It is in the Rumsey(ph) area of east central Alberta and is representative of the central-parkland natural region and composes approximately 3,400 hectares.

Private sector involvement of Provincial Parks Service continues to utilize the private sector in planning, design development and operations. The Parks Service contracts out major design and capital development projects as well as a majority of the maintenance services in the parks and recreation areas. The Alberta Provincial Parks Service is looking at private-sector operations of three more campgrounds in the next fiscal year. We presently have five on stream.

One of the new programs that we have just gotten into approximately a year and a half ago is a Park Ventures Fund and it is a program that I am very excited about. Previous to this, we have never had the ability in parks in Alberta to take gifts of either land or money and put them directly towards the use of the parks service. The Park Ventures Fund allows this to happen and, within the year and a half that it has been operating, we have received over $200,000.00 in the form of land and monies. Some examples are the donation of a half section near Calgary for a wildlife habitat park, one donation containing three parcels of parkland valued at $250,000.00 plus some $750,000.00 in cash and convertible donations which are being presently worked on.

Another activity that I think is particularly important this last year in our system - and I am sure Alan will mention this as well - is the nomination of Cyprus Hills Provincial Park in Alberta as part of an interprovincial park in conjunction with Saskatchewan.

Last year on August the 25th, during the FPPC Conference, the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta entered into an agreement which set forth the framework for establishing interprovincial parks along with our common border. A second agreement was also signed at that time which designated Cyprus Hills Provincial Park on both sides of the border as the first interprovincial park in Canada. Through this agreement, Alberta and Saskatchewan have agreed to work jointly to protect the unique and significant resources of the Cyprus Hills and to encourage compatible park experiences for all visitors.

In summary, as I have mentioned in the introduction, this past year has been one of great change which has supplied the Provincial Parks Service management and staff with a challenge, not only to continue to supply high-quality services to the public, but to do so on a more decentralized mode of program delivery and with overall reductions in delivery costs.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Gerry. Now, I would like to call on Wayne Burley from New Brunswick.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. WAYNE BURLEY, NEW BRUNSWICK

MR. W. BURLEY (Director of Technical Services, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Heritage, New Brunswick): Thanks, Don. I refer you to our written report for the nuts and bolts of the past year for the Parks System in New Brunswick. I would like to just spend these few minutes dealing with a few of our key areas and provide you with some additional information on those.

With respect to the New Brunswick Provincial Parks and Heritage Sites master plan, we had certainly hoped that, by now, each of the Directors would have been sent a copy of our study. I think some of you have heard about it in previous years. It has been a major effort for us over a three-year process. The cat is not quite out of the bag, the study is complete, we have all the copies all ready to be sent out, but our Cabinet has still deferred the tabling of the report or tabling making it public. We anticipate, within the next few weeks, to get the okay to release the report. This is a consultant report that will then be followed up by staff, both in headquarters and the regions, preparing a response package, going to our government's Policy and Priorities Committee with a major presentation on really the future and what will be the guts of the Provincial Parks System in New Brunswick.

I would like to take this opportunity, though, to share with you a few of the key recommendations that have come out of this major report for us, the first time that our system has had such a report or study conducted on it.

Number one is a new definition for provincial parks in New Brunswick, one that is perhaps less tied in with the tourism industry as has been the tradition of the development of our system, which has been quite closely linked with tourism development and tourism attractions. We certainly are not going to and will not be allowed to forget about that important aspect and that important role that parks play, but the new definition stresses the protection aspect and lays out a definition to represent the significant natural areas of the province, based on a not yet completed natural regions map. A recommendation has been made on that, a recommendation that most of the provincial parks follow a 20 - 1 ratio of developed-undeveloped land, which would be something quite new for us. Also, besides that type of recommendation, which results in fairly large properties making up the system, on the other hand, some outstanding, natural attractions might also warrant the continued designation of a provincial park.

The study lays out a criteria process for evaluating the present system and the disposition of properties within the present system to what we have to do to meet the new definition and then what we do with the properties that do not and the strategy for removal of those properties from the system. On the other hand, we also have recommendations on expanding the system and that is the positive side that we hope to be able to concentrate on.

On a detailed, management-planning process, it has been recommended that it be put in place for all parts in the system and that this process involve citizen advisory committees. We went through a fairly extensive, citizen-participation process on the master plan - again, a first for New Brunswick on such a scale - and the recommendation of the study is that that thrust be continued and involve regional staff and headquarters staff through the management-planning process and that it be ongoing, again, echoing a lot of the other reports that we have heard this morning.

The integration of natural and historic parks into one system was a Parks and Heritage Sites master plan. Our Department is responsible for the heritage system and the heritage parks in the province. There are recommendations about a more integrated approach and it is interesting to note that one of our key projects that we celebrated on Parks Day was the designation of a provincial park as a significant, provincial historic site.

Just a couple of weeks ago, the archaeological dig underway on this provincial park discovered an early Acadian foundation, perhaps one of the most significant finds that has ever taken place in the province with something that old. So, right now, we are quite integrated in that park in that our ecological branch, heritage branch and parks branch are all working together now on a very significant project and one that is going to carry on in the future and we are quite excited about it.

There is a recommendation that whole-park concessioning not be considered, but, on the other hand, however possible, that components of park operations be privatized; and the recommendation has listed campgrounds, golf courses, ski hills and a number of other components. This very week, one of our key staff members is in British Columbia meeting with staff of Jake's shop and we are appreciative of the assistance that has been provided to this date and the insights that we are going to receive from staff in B.C.

We have a lot to learn and we are going to be, hopefully, approaching many other agencies in the province to find out more about this aspect before we jump. We have always had a tradition in the New Brunswick Parks System of private-sector cooperation and certain areas have been privatized over the past, but this report is recommending that that be carried further and become much more extensive.

There were recommendations, obviously, regarding interpretation of parks programs which were almost non-existent in the New Brunswick system. The consultant made the comment that welcoming a visitor to a park, taking their money and then not having an interpretive program is just like inviting someone to your house for dinner, seeing them in the front door and then leaving by the back door. So, we have a lot of work to do there.

The implementation plan that comes along with the report is a ten-year strategy. We are trying to stress that with the Minister for him to pass on to his cabinet colleagues that, although there were very politically-sensitive recomendations coming out of this report, what has been anticipated is that it will take time to put in place and, hopefully, we will not have the problems, especially with the citizens advisory groups that we hope to set up.

Another key item that we are stressing - and we are not sure how we are going to make out with this one - is that, although the report recommends downsizing, in that it is anticipated that there will not be the number of sites that the Department will be operating, the resources presently in the budget for those sites will not be lost, but reallocated to improve the constraints and to do some of these programming initiatives that have been recommended on the other hand. So, it is going to be interesting, as we are faced with what we already know is a significant cut in our budget coming up for next year, to be able to argue, based now on a detailed plan, to keep those scarce resources and to do better with what remains in the system. Once again, we hope very soon to be able to send each of your jurisdications a copy of our masterplan.

Another area that really has happened since I had to write the report for the State of the Nation Address is a repositioning initiative in our division which has just been announced a few weeks ago. It involves the ties that we had with the tourism side of our Department and, I guess, the breakup of the connection that there had been in the past where district staff looking after the parks system will lose their tourism responsibility. In many cases, this means one key staff person will be assigned directly to the Marketing Branch in Fredericton. This will allow district staff to focus on parks with the added responsibility of the provincial information centers and historic sites.

So, in essence, they will be looking after the operation of all of the Department's facilities in their district. I see it as a real opportunity to use the skills and talents of some of these people whose backgrounds have been more in tourism than in parks. They will be a real asset for the future of our parks system in terms of promoting, marketing and building this public constituency that has been recommended in our master plan. They have a lot of contacts and ties with the volunteers, the municipalities and the corporate sector out in the province.

Another aspect of the respositioning has been the appointment of John Archibald, whom I do not have to introduce to most of you, as the Executive Director of Parks responsible for the district staff and park operations. Another significant change coming out of this repositioning is a change in our division name to Parks and Recreation; the word "Parks" had not been in the previous title, so we are quite happy with that.

My time is up, so I just wanted to make mention of a happening that is going to take place at Parley Beach Provincial Park. Some of you might have remembered last year when we were able to share with you our experience with the Beach Boys Concert and 50,000 people landing on one of our beaches last Canada Day weekend. We were able to put together a position paper and obtained Cabinet approval to use it as a guideline and, this year, we are looking at what we anticipate is a smaller concert happening later in August when we can better prepare for it.

We have Milli-Vinelli coming on August the 5th to Parley Beach. I had to take the contract over to get the Minister filling in for our Minister to sign it and she thought that this was a gal, a one-lady rock band; so, they are not quite the impact, we think, that the Beach Boys had on our system which was a complete overload.

As Gordon had mentioned, these events can really tax your system, but we feel that we are much more organized this year and August is a better time. That was one of the points that we stressed, i.e. spreading these things out over the summer to give us time to organize. Yet, on the other hand, it could be a completely different crowd from what we had at the Beach Boys concert, so we are not quite sure what to anticipate, but that is the big event coming up for us next month. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Wayne. No doubt you are going to attract a different crowd. I think that you probably had the older generation for the Beach Boys, but you are going to see a lot of kids, I am sure, and teenagers for Milli-Vinilli.

I would now like to call on Ian Rutherford for the Canadian Parks Service.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. IAN RUTHERFORD, CANADA

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Director General, National Parks, Canadian Parks Service, Canada): Thank you, Don. In view of the time remaining, this has to be called squeezing the feds down to size.

I am going to refer very closely to the written report and concentrate on updating it, since it was written about three months ago, and adding some additional material which has come to light since then.

I want to touch, first of all, on the National Parks Policy, which I think was covered in last year's report. We said last year that it was being reviewed and would go out for public consultation during the coming year. It has not gone out for public consultation for various reasons, but I believe that we have received permission now to release it very shortly, next week, I think. It has, in the meantime, been through a stage of consultation with various focus groups resulting in a better understanding on all sides of our position and their position. It will be out in the public's hands over the summer and we will start a formal consultation process this fall after the green plan is announced. And I will talk about the green plan in just a moment.

The second thing I wanted to mention, which is not covered in the report, is a strategic plan for the Canadian Parks Service, which has been in the works for some time now. We had an earlier version about a year ago, but senior management of CPS has now finalized a strategic plan for the coming decade or so and it is hoped to take that forward to get approval of the Deputy Minister and the Minister in the next little while. That will be a very important document for guiding our efforts in the coming decade.

The framework for discussion on the environment was released at the end of March this year, i.e. the green plan or, at least, the discussion document for the green plan. The green plan is also known as an environmental agenda for Canada. It is a major piece of legislation which also was expected to be presented earlier than is now going to be the case. It was considered by Cabinet over the winter and they advised a public consultation phase, which took place this spring and ended in June. The results of that are now being digested and will result in the formulation of a final version of the environmental agenda, which will go to Cabinet some time this fall and will be finalized and made public, I think, some time around November 1st.

That is a document which has major implications for the Canadian Parks Service. Even in its present form, the previous Minister made a commitment to completion of the National Parks System in a phased way, five new national parks by 1995 and completion of at least the land-based system by the year 2000 and the establishment of three new marine parks by 1995. Since we have responsibility for both national parks and national historic sites, there are words in there to the effect that we will commemorate at least an additional seven key historic themes by 1995 and, I think, another eight by the year 2000. So, it is a major, major effort which, if it comes to pass, would amount to a pace of a new park creation or a new site creation such as we have not seen in the past. As you know, the system is a little bit more than half complete and it has taken us over a hundred years to get that far, and we are talking about completing it in a decade. So, that is by no means an easy task and it is going to require a good deal of support from provincial and territorial governments, continued progress on native land claims, broad-based public support, particularly at the local level which, indeed, is the critical element for national park creation, and, of course, the cooperation and assistance of the NGO community.

In addition to new park creation, the green plan also contains plans for maintaining and upgrading levels of service to the public, for improving our capability to do the protection job that is primary in our mandate and looking at ways of finding partners to both finance and manage our existing parks system.

Sustainable development, of course, is the notion behind the green plan and it is the theme of this conference. I do not intend to spend too much time on that because that will be discussed in the workshops.

The challenge for all of us is to see where we can find opportunities to enhance the enjoyment, appreciation and understanding of our heritage resources, on the part of the public that we serve, to make sure that we respect the ecological integrity of those resources in the case of natural parks and to carry out initiatives, such as using environmentally-acceptable products in our systems, developing ongoing visitor-management techniques and, a major thrust in our green plan, the inclusion of environmental messages in our interpretation programs, i.e. environmental messages that not only cover the park situation, but go beyond and deal with some of the more global concerns.

Under the heading of protecting and presenting the natural heritage, I just want to allude briefly to the item on some of the implications of Bill C-30, the amendments to the National Parks Act, which took place in 1988. That included major new fines for poaching and we have been working to upgrade our capacity to deal with that kind of activity. We have hired specialized personnel, a lot of new equipment and we are the first non-police agency to have access to the Canadian Police Information Center, which is a major increase in our capability to deal with those who are on the other side of the law.

The ERP business is also an expanding business. We have been heavily involved in ERP panel hearings. We are still awaiting the report from the ERP panel concerning the Wood Buffalo National Park bison disease question. That recommendation is expected in June, but it will probably come out in early August. In order to better manage and understand what is going on in that situation, we have embarked on a rather extensive and expensive research program into the genetics of that herd because our position is that we should not adopt lightly any solution which risks losing the valuable genetic material represented by what is the largest, free-roaming herd of bison in the world and a major genetic resource.

We have also been involved in hearings for radar sites, believe it or not, in national parks. One of our national parks lies on the location of the old DEW line, now being upgraded, and we have had to reach agreement with the Department of National Defence to install radar at two locations, one in the park and one just outside. That has also involved extensive interaction with the Inuviallet(ph) who have a say in everything that happens in that area.

We have also made submissions to the Northern Alberta Pulp Mill Hearings, which are still awaiting a final decision.

In the area of serving the public, we did a national marketing survey some time ago and the results of that have been released. I believe you all received copies of that. We have also finalized a national marketing strategy which should be available to you all shortly.

We did a major filming project at Waterton Lakes National Park and that involved cooperation both with the NGO community and with the commercial sector. We will be doing a similar project this year in the North at Iuwetik(ph), I believe.

The Globe '90 Conference in Vancouver also was a major activity on the part of many of our members.

We have initiated a public consultation on park fees, particularly for senior citizens, and on services to senior citizens, in general, involving the Second Century Conservation Club, a group of retired park professionals, with some funding from the senior secretariat, and this was alluded to, I think, in our workshops last year. It has not gotten off the ground yet, but we will get going shortly.

I have just been handed a piece of paper that says my time is gone, although that does not agree with my watch. I will simply refer you to the paper for the remainder of what I might have said. There is information there on our specific plans for new parks. They are quite extensive and many of them are getting quite close to completion. I think they are all covered there, although some of the timings are not quite as indicated.

One I would pick out, I think, is the agreement with Quebec on the Saguenay Marine Park. This was going to be a groundbreaking arrangement for us and, I think, for Quebec. We have an agreement in principle with them and we are presently working on legislation to put in place a regime which would allow joint management of that very significant marine area. Thank you.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Ian. Perhaps we can, for about five minutes, before we break for lunch, take a couple of questions, if you have any for these people who are here. That is not to say that you cannot have questions later on this afternoon, but take the opportunity at this point in time.

Yes, Norm.

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): Wayne, regarding your master plan, I do not know how much you can reveal of some more of the findings. The whole business of contracting-out or privatization, by really divesting yourself of some of the parks, how serious are the recommendations looking at that sort of thing?

MR. W. BURLEY (New Brunswick): Maybe I should turn that one over to Jim. There have been some very serious recommendations made, there is no question. They are just recommendations now. What we are doing, in visiting B.C. and probably calling up some of your people and some others, is coming up with a position where we see things from our end of it. This is what the experts have said and here is how we react to that in making our position to government.

Just in this past year, two parks have closed and, for now, they have been put in park-reserve status, but that is only until this master plan has been accepted and the national plan is put in place whereby they could very well be turned over to other departments or for disposal by our central agency that gets rid of Crown assets. Another four parks have been put out to private sector on a three-year concession basis, so the politicians seem ready to make hard decisions regarding the parks. These have all been what one might call marginal facilities in terms of our whole system.

For our people, there is no question that that is going to have to be thought about long and hard and we are not sure just what is going to happen with that, but the recommendation is there. We are going to work now on what that means, so they can get a clear picture. As I wanted to stress, what we are also going to say is that, if you decide this, just do not decide it and use it as a way of reducing our budget, I mean, taking all the money that used to operate that golf course. We want to do all of this other work and, as others have said - and Jake, in particular - there are a lot of other areas to redirect our funds to, but we are not going to be paying any attention to resource-management interpretation and the concession management itself which, in the past, we have tended to offer up all of the money and it leaves you nothing for ongoing maintenance and concession management.

So, those are some of the areas that we have to do quite a bit of work on, but we think they are going to take it very seriously.

CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for one of the panelists?

Let us break for lunch. We will be back sharp at 2:00 o'clock so that we can continue the finalization of the State of the Nation Reports. Before you leave, there is a handout at the registration desk on the workshops, listing the participants at each workshop. I would advise you to pick that up before you come back and I will explain the particular details later on this afternoon with regards to that.

LUNCH BREAK

JULY 18,1990

AFTERNOON SESSION

CHAIRMAN: To continue the program, the first presentation this afternoon will be from Prince Edward Island. Doug Murray.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. DOUGLAS MURRAY, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

MR. D. MURRAY (Director, Parks Division, Department of Tourism and Parks, Prince Edward Island): Thank you, Don. I mentioned to Jake Masselink briefly, after this morning's session, that the difference in scale in our parks systems is that all of mine would probably fit inside one of his smaller parks, but that does not change the challenges. It just means that we have to find different ways of doing things with the kinds of resources we each have.

To put our parks system in perspective, we belong to the Department of Tourism and Parks and, as such, we are in the economic development side of our government. As a result of this fact and our limited resources within the branch, we forged, I believe, some successful working linkages with the Departments of Environment, Energy and Forestry, Community and Cultural Affairs and, outside government, with Island Nature Trust. That is the only way that we are going to be able to address the challenges of protection and preservation in the future.

In terms of scale of our parks system, we operate 31 provincial parks, which includes 14 campgrounds, 2 golf courses and 1 ski hill. Provincial parks in Prince Edward Island are adhering to objectives right now aimed at revitalizing the parks we have. The majority of our parks are 25 years old and they have seen some diminished use in the last decade for a variety of reasons. It has levelled off in the last few years, emphasis being placed on facility improvement and on park community development.

Park community development has sparked the creation of a new program which we call "This is your park". We use it with our park's logo. It is a pilot project this year. The program is being aimed at the park community in its broadest sense. We could define that as being the area around the park, the town, the village or whatever. We are a highly developed province so that parks are not out in remote areas. It could also be tourism associations, recreation or naturalist groups, etc..

Formal involvement from this community is being sought to blend both our objectives and their objectives, to increase the awareness and utilization of the parks, to provide a better quality experience for visitors and to permit them more contact with islanders and, I hope, a bigger variety of programs. "This is your park" Committees are being supported and, where there is an interest, facilitators are being appointed for each and all staff in the individual parks are fully involved.

On the gimmick side, I guess we are picking up the annual provincial marketing themes in parks as well. The 1990 theme is "We're akin to Ireland"; it is being heavily sold from P.E.I. and we are right in the middle of it. It shows in all our programming.

Another initiative is that we have finally computerized. This may not be new news to a lot of you, but computerization has hit all of us now in P.E.I. Regional offices now have word processing, spread sheets, data-base capability and we are in the middle of a big training programming. We have also taken on departmental computer planning, simply because of capability within my branch.

In our organization, we requested several new initiatives this year; one of them was for additional seasonal staff and we obtained 4.8 man years of additional time. We are back now to, I think, the level we had over a decade ago which, I think, finally, allows us to adequately cover our parks that we are trying to operate. Also, there has been a longstanding effort on the branch to convert some of the key seasonal positions to part-time permanent positions and we have - it says 9 in this report - but we now have 11 of them approved out of the 27 that I requested.

In projects, we have two resort parks in the province that you may be familiar with. Anybody that has been to the conferences in the past is aware of them. At Mill River, there is a new recreation complex which is nearing completion now, which includes a new pool and racquet ball facilities. It is not being operated by us, but it will support the hotel that is there, which is privately operated, the community around the park and the park visitors, so it is a nice addition to that park. We have added 7 kilometers of lighted Nordic ski trails because the hotel there is now open in the wintertime.

At Brudenell(ph), there is a new hotel complex scheduled to begin construction in September, which is badly needed in that park.

There is also a third championship golf course that has been started. I do not mean on the ground, but the planning has started at Crowbush Coal Provincial Park, which is on the north shore not too far from the National Park.

With respect to our capital funding, we have gotten good support this year for Brookvale Provincial Park. We developed a Nordic site for the 1991 Canada Winter Games last year. It has been in use in the past season and the finishing touches will be done this this summer. The alpine facility in that park is not involved in the games, but a two-year program to substantially improve facilities there has also been approved. I will not go into details because they are in the report. The Highways Branch is very involved in this project and the Forestry Branch as well. We are borrowing on a lot of other talent in provincial government. The Nordic site, particularly, has been much enhanced by the involvement of the Forestry Branch and we think that it is a superior facility.

We have a small park in the very eastern end of the island which we are going to completely renovate and enlarge, called Red Point Provincial Park.

Provincial Parks is one of the four natural resource departments in Prince Edward Island who are assuming responsibilities for natural areas and sustainable development issues. The Department of Environment is the lead agency and Island Nature Trust is represented at our Director-level meetings.

There are two projects underway this summer which will lead to policy recommendations to government. Island Nature Trust is training a project team which is now in operation - it was in training when I wrote this. It is reviewing all potential natural areas in the province including IVP sites which were identified over a decade ago. Also, my branch has added one project worker dedicated to review all of our lands, mainly our backup lands.

Both of these initiatives will provide information to our Natural Areas Advisory Committee in the fall of 1990. This committee includes Parks and it approved 11 natural areas for designation in 1989 under the Natural Areas Protection Act. That is not under my Department. It is under the Department of Environment, but it included two areas in provincial parks and one in Parks-managed backup lands.

The major capital projects, I mentioned above. I am talking in terms of privatization now or the private operation of things in parks. These major projects are being done through industrial commissions funded by the Department of Industry. There are other projects being done in other parks, such as a swimming pool, a comfort station and canteen facility and other roofed accommodations, again, all with commission funding, some of which, by the way, is coming from Hong Kong.

In regard to marketing and tourism initiatives, the marketing campaign was started in 1989 as a pilot project. It has been supported this year with no initiative funding. Our summer and winter promotions are in both print and broadcast media and the target markets are in-province for broadcast and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for print media.

We also participated with the P.E.I. Campground Association on what is known as the Sea-Sail Cruise to New England this year.

Our winter package is aimed at the new Nordic competition site prepared for the games and a video is being produced with the cooperation of the Nordic Ski Association, which is our community around that park.

We are looking to place bids. We now have the 1992 Canadian Junior Championships. We are looking beyond. There is no reason why we cannot be into World Cups like they do in Labrador.

Our statistics are attached to this report, but I will not go into them in any extensive detail. Suffice it to say that our budgets are up gross 27% this year, mainly as a result of the capital funding.

Our visitation in 1989 was up 10.7% over 1988 and that is a highly weather-related statistic. I think the success story is in the fact that, in the first year, we offered full reservations across the system in all of our campgrounds and 10.3% of our camper nights were reserved. I will leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Doug. The next presentation will be Peter Neugehauer from the Northwest Territories.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. PETER NEUGEHAUER, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

MR. P. NEUGEHAUER (Northwest Territories): Thank you. You, of course, have our written submission, so what I would like to do is just briefly outline some of our park initiatives which, I think, are worthy of highlighting from an agency perspective. They are the sorts of things that, from the inside looking out, I think are important and are helping to push our parks system and our parks activities along.

Just as a bit of background, one of the Northwest Territories' most striking characteristics is its sparce population of about 60,000 people in 60 communities spread across one-third of northern Canada. In the Northwest Territories, within our territorial government system, are 50 some parks which range from small pulloffs, roadside use-areas, access points and larger parks with 20 to 30 sites fully developed with visitors centers and other facilities. They are housed in the Division of Tourism and Parks in the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. Our sister divisions within the Department include Arts and Crafts, Small Business Development and Renewable Resource Development, all within the same Department under the same roof.

From the perspective of park agencies being at different stages of evolution at different periods of time, we have discussed this at almost all conferences and at all the meetings that split off from these conferences. I believe that the N.W.T. system is in a development stage and is, I think, by many standards, at a very rapid development stage. Quite simply, we have a lot of things happening at the same time. We have a lot on our plates.

I would like to mention a few of these activities and perhaps put them into perspective. They include a wide variety in range and they vary greatly in scale and sophistication, but I think that they are activities that are helping to gel our parks system, form a direction, achieve public awareness and political support and also provide staff morale. I will mention these activities in no particular order and they go from policy and planning to capital development building to operational details.

First, I would like to report that we are developing a parks policy which focuses on the creation of parks for tourism and economic-development purposes. We are in the process of sifting through the responses from the various interest groups who have reviewed this policy and we are in the process now of making adjustments and, hopefully, within the next year, we will have our policy in place.

Concurrently, along with the development of this parks policy, our Department and our Division developed a tourism strategy for the next five-year period. This tourism strategy has a strong role for parks. It identifies parks, both national and territorial, as tourism-destination areas and economic-development stimulators.

Secondly, I would like to refer to our ambitious capital program, a program that I think is ambitious by northern standards and perhaps by the standards of smaller jurisdictions, as well. This year, we have a $7.5 million budget. To put things into perspective, again, in contrast, we collected less then $100,000.00 in park-user fees last year. I believe that works out to a ratio of about 7,500 to 1. Now, try selling that position at budget time in most jurisdictions. What this situation illustrates is the support and the positive attitude towards the development of parks in a parks system in the territories. Again, it identifies a period of rapid growth. We have strong ministerial support and our government is counting on us, not only to create parks, but, at the same time, to create jobs along with parks development and to provide local benefits.

An outline of our capital projects is included in our report, but I would like to, again, for a moment, mention the role of visitors centers in parks and tourism development. This, again, is an ambitious program. It is in a program of multiple-use buildings. Currently, we have 7 or 8 visitors centers in various stages of development. They are located in parks, near parks and at regional, gateway locations across the Northwest Territories.

All of these centers, when complete, will highlight the tourism and outdoor-recreation opportunities provided by territorial parks, national parks, reserves and the outdoor-adventure travel opportunities to special places in the territories.

The next item that I would like to refer to is the Parks Day. Parks Day had an extremely positive impact on the awareness of parks across the Northwest Territories. Perhaps an indication of the width and breadth of the parks network across the nation was found in the Eastern Arctic, where parks were still snowbound on June 9th. However, from another point in view, in terms of numbers, we had about a hundred people actually come out to participate in the parks across the Northwest Territories. If we get into the numbers games, that represents 2% of our population. I wonder how that stacks up in other jurisdictions. As well, many more people were aware of Parks Day through the media and through school presentations.

Another item I would like to comment on is my perception of the status of protection-oriented parks in areas in the Northwest Territories. To me, the concept of the completed parks system is foreign. We, of course, in the Territories establish parks or support the establishment of national park reserves or other protected areas on a needs-and-opportunity basis. As a planner looking ahead over the next five to ten years, I see a multi-layered system of parks and protected areas across the north, which will far exceed any existing numerical or acreage criteria. It will include a wide variety of components as the result of the establishment of territorial national parks, reserves, sanctuaries and lands set aside under the various land claims processes. I think that that is something that we can look forward to.

Our current focus to do with the development of protected areas is to support compatible, national-park initiatives across the north. I note, from the Endangered Species Report, that 40% of the area of national-park properties in the country is in the Northwest Territories and I am sure that this portion will increase as we are currently investigating several opportunities in cooperation with the Canada Parks Service. These opportunities are, as well, outlined in our report.

Another item that I would like to refer to as a parks highlight, to me and, I think, to the people in our system, is that we now have a consistent image across the north. People on our staff work very hard and diligently to develop new uniforms and it is the first time that these uniforms have been consistent. We operate on a regional basis and, from time to time, different people selected different types of uniforms. The identification might have been similar, but it was not tied together.

Our current system of uniforms is highlighted by blue anoraks and parkas and, although they still have shoulder crests and identifications, the uniforms give more of a backpacking, Eddie Bauer look, I believe, to our staff who are working in the field and with the public. We are getting away from that Corrections Canada image and I believe that it fits in with our ideology that parks are there for activities in terms and purposes. As well, the designing and the issuing of these uniforms has had a very positive effect on the morale of the parks staff and it makes them feel part of the family.

On a further item, I guess, last year in Saskatchewan, I talked about some park initiatives in the Mackenzie Mountains. Specifically, these were the Ram Plateau area near Nahanni National Park and the Canal Trail, which stretches from Norman Welles on the Mackenzie River to the Yukon border. I am pleased to provide an update today and I believe that we have now virtually completed all the necessary community consultations. The results have been positive and I believe that large-scale, outdoor recreation parks can be created in the future in the territories. Perhaps these parks will be trading in conjunction with the land claims processes that we are now embroiled in.

A further development that relates to parks and protected areas and outdoor recreation occurred on Monday, when we tabled our management plans for the Thelon and Kazan Rivers. We, of course, anticipate that these rivers will be designated as Canadian Heritage Rivers and it is our plan to continue this process and bring forth other nominations and management plans as soon as possible.

In closing, on behalf of myself and Alan Vaughan, my Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for Tourism and Parks, I would like to thank Don Hustins and the conference for the opportunity to talk about the N.W.T. park initiatives and what, I think, are highlights. As well, we also appreciate the acknowledgement of the group and that park agencies are, in fact, in different stages of evolution and work within many different geographic and economic environments. We have enjoyed a great deal of success and cooperation in the various programs associated with the conference. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Peter. I now call on Alan Appleby from Saskatchewan.

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. ALAN APPLEBY, SASKATCHEWAN

MR. A. APPLEBY (Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, Saskatchewan): Thank you, Don. A lot of things have been going on in Saskatchewan and I guess the best evidence I had of that was when I asked my staff to prepare some speaking notes for the State of the Nation Address and I received a bundle of 24 pages. I was thinking how I would have to edit that down while I was travelling and, as soon as I arrived in Newfoundland, Don Hustins had a FAX for me, three more pages. I guess the printer ran out before they got the whole speech done. But I have edited it down and so here we go.

Saskatchewan parks have made some significant accomplishments and movements forward this year, working on parks systems planning, a new mining policy and the completion of parks-management strategies, enhanced cooperation between departmental branches responsible for aspects of our parks system, new regional, parks-maintenance agreements and the launching of Parks Outdoor Ventures, a private-sector program. The Department has had a very challenging and effective year.

We also got our old name back. We were Parks, Recreation and Culture for the last few years and we are back to being Parks and Renewable Resources. So, all of those parks staff people who saved their old shoulder flashes and sewed them back on or never took them off in the first place got a bonus.

In parks systems planning, our draft parks-systems plan, which examines existing parks system and suggests future parkland designations, will be going to the public this year, we hope this fall. The plan covers three park classifications, recreation and natural environment and wilderness parks and there is a separate effort on historic parks which is moving along.

The Department recently developed a new policy on mining in provincial parks. Lac La Ronge Provincial Park already has an abandoned mine site, but it also has other claims which are active, so mining will be allowed in Lac La Ronge Provincial Park, where current claims exist in the mineral exploration zone; otherwise, no mining is allowed in Saskatchewan provincial parks. That was a policy which we had expected to be hard fought, but, in fact, through several years of very close work with the Saskatchewan Mining Association who were at the conference in Regina last year to represent some of their perspectives on parks, we actually were able to put a policy in place with absolutely no negative feedback either from the Mining Association or from the public.

Park management strategy says that part of our program is to document park use and development. Our management strategies are now in place for eight provincial parks, six more are in the works and four more have been started in the current fiscal year, so we are making very quick progress towards getting management strategies in place for all of our provincial parks.

In park operations, we were experiencing some problems, especially in resource management and the coordination of decision-making within the Department, given that our Parks Branch is not responsible for the operation of our parks and we established a parks-operations coordinator role. There is a person who staffs that position and the parks-operation coordinator is supported by a management committee which takes a fairly broad view across the Department of the kinds of activities that go into developing and operating our parks system.

For our 101 regional parks, effective starting the 1989-90 fiscal year, a new Regional Parks Act was passed in the legislature which introduced a new method of paying maintenance grants. Rather than being paid on an open formula, we are now negotiating agreements which set maintenance payments on a fixed amount on a five-year basis, so that both the parks and ourselves can budget a little better than was possible in previous years. Those maintenance-grant agreements are tied into their five-year, capital agreements so that capital and maintenance now go hand in hand.

In the past, only municipalities who sponsored regional parks were a part of capital and maintenance agreements. The new Act allows service clubs and other non-profit organizations to participate as sponsors which will bring more money into the regional parks system.

The Department is continuing to coordinate delivery of a number of programs through assistance by the private sector. A Parks Outdoor Adventures Program was launched in 1989. Those are educational and skill-development programs that are facilitated by outdoor businesses and have offered such activities as mountain biking, canoeing, fishing and hiking to visitors in Saskatchewan provincial parks.

Also, in cooperation with the private sector, a Parks Vacation Package Program was developed in 1989 and it is being implemented this year. These packages are planned vacations which revolve around tours to and through several of our major destination parks. Three tours are planned for this summer's kick-off year.

Our private-sector program continues to provide new developments and substantial improvement to existing park facilities. Projects completed to date and proposals currently under construction or pending approval amount to over $17 million in private-capital construction, 148 person-years of construction employment and 114 person-years of ongoing, operating development. New or renewed release agreements in 1989-90 include one more of our golf courses and two more of our ski hills. The largest private investment program this year will be the development of a year-round resort at our Battleford Provincial Park for two and a half million dollars and that is a rather unique development in that it is a partnership between ourselves, as the provincial park agency, the Salto(ph) Indian Band which lies adjacent to the park, and the Federal Department of Indian Affairs. The Salto Band will take over the operation of our golf courses as part of the operation of their new resort complex.

Our Department also completed an in-house review of architectural themes for parks and the result will be park-specific guidelines to provide a characteristic architectural theme or consistent visual image - in some cases, architectural theme sounds a little too fancy - a consistent visual image for each of our parks and we are hoping that this will reinforce the concept that each park is a unique and special place and these guidelines will also apply to any major, new building undertaken by the private sector.

A resource management unit was established to coordinate a variety of resource-extraction issues that we are now facing, especially oil and gas exploration. One of the other functions of this unit will be to produce vegetation management plans. We have had some severe problems in recent years with forest disease, pest infestations, blowdowns and fire hazards in some of our mature and, as some folks say, over-mature forests. We are also having some concern expressed over the amount of native grassland left in some of our Prairie parks given that we protect the forest vegetation so well.

Our Department, in conjunction with that effort, prepared a document entitled, "The Management of Saskatchewan Parklands" and I believe a copy of that has been sent to each agency. If you have not seen it, please let me know so that we can get one in the mail to you. It provides an overview of Saskatchewan's parklands and how they are managed and it is the first public document of its kind and has attracted wide, public interest.

As in previous years, Saskatchewan recognized a Parks Week which we do in the middle portion of July to promote and encourage people to visit parks. The 1990 Parks Week coincides with what is called Play Week. Through this activity, we have gained recognition around the province for our provincial parks.

With respect to visitation trends, the recorded visitation to Saskatchewan Parks in 1989-90 was estimated to have increased by approximately 4% over 1988. There appears to be a trend in entry-permit use away from seasonal and towards daily, which obviously are cheaper, and free senior citizen passes. In Saskatchewan, if you have a senior in the car, then the whole carload gets in. So, what we are finding is that more and more people are shanghaiing Grandma and bringing her along to the park. So, instead of six people in the car, there are seven now. Anyway, that is something that we are taking a look at.

But one thing that I noticed, and I have heard this in several of the presentations made today, is that the number of camping permits have decreased again last year, as it has in several recent years in Saskatchewan parks, as compared to the increase in day-use. And that seems to be a trend that I have heard coming from several jurisdictions.

My time is over. Well, there was not much more to say. Anything I had other than that is in the written text and I will just conclude by referring you to that and inviting any questions you might have. Thank you very much for your attention.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alan. Now, I am the last speaker and what I will do is pass the watch to Alan so that he can time me; how is that?

STATE OF THE NATION REPORT

MR. DON HUSTINS, NEWFOUNDLAND

MR. D. HUSTINS (Director of Parks, Department of Environment and Lands, Newfoundland): Actually, I think I can make mine rather short because the Minister has already mentioned a number of things this morning regarding, obviously, the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve. It is the most significant program initiative we have had this year with the designation of this 2,900 square kilometer area. The core component, of course, of the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve is the Baie du Nord River, itself, and he also mentioned the fact that the river itself is under study for the possible designation of a Canadian Heritage River.

He also mentioned the designation of a couple of other ecological reserves and fossil sites in various parts of the province that have happened this past year and there are several others that have gone into provisional reserve status as well at this point in time. As I mentioned earlier, of course, this has, in fact, more than doubled the total land protected in the provincial parks system in the province.

But one of the interesting things is that, while we are making great strides in designating some of these lands, one of the things that we do not have is a systems plan to guide us. Of course, we are working very closely with the Protected Areas Association in regard to this, whereby we are funding them, as well as the World Wildlife Fund, to develop a systems plan in identifying natural areas in the province. You will hear more about this, obviously, through the other speakers in the next few hours.

In terms of our capital budget, not as much as the N.W.T., but we had an $852,000.00 budget this past year for some very significant projects. In particular, $200,000.00 of that was related to occupational health and safety matters for capital improvement of our physical buildings. We put a couple of hundred thousand dollars into one of our new parks, Sandbanks Park. I call it new; however, it is about 10 years old, but it is one of the more recent parks in the system. We also put a couple of hundred thousand dollars into completing comfort stations in a couple of parks. It is very significant in that the only park, thus far, that has a comfort station operating is one on the west coast.

That is one of the 41 camping parks that have comfort stations and we now have two more to be completed this year. The comfort station that I am referring to, of course, is flushed toilets and shower facilities for the campers.

During the winter, we had a major program which started off last fall with regard to the Newfoundland Winter Games and a five-kilometer, competitive, cross-country ski trail was developed in one of our parks in the central part of the province, and a very elaborate ski chalet. The chalet building not only will be used for skiers, of course, as a warmup and a shelter, but we also have that chalet in full program this summer with summer activity and recreation programs in there as well.

In regard to park exhibits, those of you who are going on a field trip in a couple of days, Friday, will get a chance to see some of the new exhibits that we have erected in our parks. We have 41 camping parks and we have a new exhibit that informs the campers of the type of class of the park and the kinds of activities that are available in the park and, of course, it describes also the entire parks classification system. You will see these, again, in a couple of parks on Friday.

We have also completed a background study on the Main River which is what we visited as a Heritage Rivers Board on Sunday of this week. The results of the study indicate that, indeed, the Main River is very much a worthy candidate to the Canadian Heritage River System and we are pursuing that matter at this point in time.

There is one item I just want to discuss for a couple of minutes and it is not, in fact, in the brochure. It is something new that we have originated this summer and I call it, for want of any better words, a staff-time review. Like all of us, I guess, here in this room, we have all had cutbacks and reductions and we are all questioning our ability to properly upgrade and maintain the parks, i.e. you have seen some other speakers here this morning with various initiatives that had been undertaken to resolve those problems.

What we are looking at, in fact, is a review. We are taking five parks, large, medium size and small, and we have broken down the actual functions that all the staff members would normally be doing in a run-of-the-mill day. We have broken it down into administration, for example, as a function, protection, visitor control and management, maintenance, and personnel management. So, if you look at their particular jobs, those are the main functions and there are many sub-functions, of course, associated with each one of those. What we have in those five pilot parks is that, every hour that these people are working, be they park officers or labourers or students, we are getting them to tally what, in fact, they are doing and how much time is spent on those various activities during the day.

The end result of this, I would hope, would give us an opportunity to see where the gaps are. What are we doing with protection? Are we more in personnel management? Are we, in fact, doing too much in terms of paper work as compared to really maintaining the park? What is the level of service that we have? And, in fact, should we be enhancing the level of service? Are there various functions here that are important to the goal of the system that we are not attending to? So, this particular study was just initiated about a month ago and I guess we will see what the results are at the end of the year. It may then, very well, be expanded to many other parks in the system.

Those are my comments with regard to our particular State of the Nation for Newfoundland. As I mentioned earlier, the full report is included in the document that you have. I will just reiterate a statement I made earlier. In terms of Quebec, while there is no presentation here today, you can find their particular presentation in the documents that you have.

We have about 10 minutes or so before 3:00 o'clock, so I would open up for discussion for any of the speakers who presented papers earlier today.

Yes, Jake.

QUESTION PERIOD

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I like the way that you have organized the presentations with P.E.I. sort of bookended on both sides by Canada and the Northwest Territories, but it is P.E.I. to whom I want to address the question. You have two resort parks that are being developed sort of by commissions; do you have master plans for those parks that guide your development?

MR. D. MURRAY (Prince Edward Island): No, we do not.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Is there any public involvement in the development of those parks?

MR. D. MURRAY (Prince Edward Island): No, these are isolated projects that one is going to add a hotel and the other is going to add an adjunct to the hotel that is already there which is a recreation facility. So, it is a core in the park that is being created.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): But it is on parkland that you administer?

MR. D. MURRAY (Prince Edward Island): Yes, it is on parkland adjacent to the golf courses that are already there and have been there for 15 or 20 years.

MR. J. MASSELINK (B ritish Columbia): Thank you. I just found that interesting. You can get away with things that we cannot.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Yes, Ian.

MR. I. ROBERTSON (Yukon): I am quite interested in this staff-time-management study. How did you sell the idea to the staff themselves to get them to keep an accurate log and how well is it going in point of fact?

CHAIRMAN: How did we sell it to the staff? I do not even know if I can answer exactly whether it is sold to the staff at this point in time. You look at the situation that we have been in in recent years where all of our field staff are seasonal. Some of these people had permanent jobs five to ten years ago and they are all now of a seasonal nature. There are further cutbacks and reductions in the forecast without any rhyme or reason, from their perspective, and they do not understand. I guess, probably, even from our own perspective, we have not been able, in all honesty, to say what our role really is. Should we operate these parks? Should we be maintaining them? Or is it really a protection function or an interpretive function, etc.?

So, I think, considering the things that have happened in the past and the probable likelihood of further changes in reductions in the future, we, obviously, gained the support of those people, particularly the people behind you in the room there at the regional level, to really analyze and come to grips with what is happening out there. Before we, in fact, face other concerns or other cutbacks, let us get a grip on it ourselves and find out really what the problems are, what is happening, what is not happening and what are those gaps for opportunities.

We then had one of the staff from headquarters, after we developed the forms, visit the parks. We picked those with the regional staff in mind, knowing full well that it might create a lot of problems because of what we are looking at. And they went out, individually, and discussed the whole program with the park officer and some of his staff and went through the whole worksheet. We are into a worksheet situation and, three weeks later, we had to revise it and approve the worksheet so that they fully understood what it was really all about. And, in fact, there were some good suggestions from a couple of those parks with regard to some of the other functions that should have been identified.

At this point in time, the information is coming in weekly and we have another individual hired in headquarters who is tallying the information. To date, I have not had any summary of that. It will be done at the end of the summer.

Yes, Ian.

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): I would just like to add a footnote to that and I would like to ask a question afterwards of someone else.

Canadian Parks Service has implemented a similar kind of cost-accounting system which attempts to find out how people actually spend their time. There has been significant staff unhappiness about filling out that kind of information and it has been difficult to sell. It has also been difficult to sell to middle-management, who did not see the point of it, but, now that the data is beginning to come in, I think people throughout the system are beginning to see some value in it and they are finding some surprises. For example, they are finding out that people are not spending their time where they thought they were and I think it will be useful information.

The question I wanted to ask was to Norm Richards, which had to do with the Ontario Tax Rebate Program. He mentioned that, if an owner wanted to get out of the program, he could do so. If he does do so, does he have to pay back all the rebates that he had during the period that he was in the program or can he flip in and out as he wishes?

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): There is a condition that you pay back.

CHAIRMAN: There is a question back there. Could you use the mike please, Neil.

MR. N. DAWE: I have got a question for Norm as well. I am quite interested in the Strategic Planning Process that you went through quickly. How did you involve staff and how did you involve any people external to your organization?

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): It is hard to remember because it has been so long now. It has taken 18 months, I guess, to prepare a strategic direction for the Ministry and, at the same time, we had several committees working on a review of the organizational structure.

We, having five or six different programs in the Ministry of Natural Resources, made a determined effort to try to involve everybody, in every program and at every level in the organization, the regional level, district level and main-office level, for both exercises. I think that it was good, but it probably took longer than it should have. I think that a success to any strategic planning exercise is to do it fairly quickly and to start implementing it as quickly as possible. If we have made any mistake, it has been that it has taken us too long to prepare the strategic direction - it has taken us 18 months - it is still not really finalized at this point. We have it in a final draft form. I understand there is a final, final one coming out within the next month or two, but the key point is to do it, I would say, over a six to twelve-month period of time and to make sure that commitment is made to start implementing as quickly as possible. So, I think we have gone through quite a learning exercise there.

The other thing that we are finding out in our organization review and changes for the future is that we have been overly democratic in trying to have everybody in the organization buy into our decision-making process before we make decisions. We are discovering that we are going to have to tighten up and there may be more arbitrary decisions made in the future by fewer people. So, it is almost going in the opposite direction. We are finding that it is just too time consuming to try to get everybody in the organization to buy in all the time.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions? This is your last chance.

Perhaps we will wrap up this session, that being the case. There are just a couple of housekeeping things to remind you of. We do break now at 3:00 o'clock for coffee and the workshops begin at 3:15 both in here and in the room across the way. I referred you this morning to the workshop participant list that would indicate which workshop we would hope that you attend so that we have a fair distribution at each workshop during the next two days.

Each of the workshops will last about an hour and a half and, of course, there is a moderator there who will introduce the workshop, the purpose of the program, etc.

I also just want to remind you of another matter. The tour tonight of the Cape Spear and Signal Hill National Historic Sites begins at 6:30 and you are expected to be at the front entrance ready to board the bus at 6:30. The first part of the trip will take you to Cape Spear, so dress warmly and comfortably because it may very well be a bit windy out there, but I am sure you will enjoy the site. You will wind up the tour later on at the visitors reception centre on Signal Hill. This whole evening, of course, is going to be hosted by the Canadian Parks Service.

JULY 18,1990

AFTERNOON SESSION

WORKSHOP "A"

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PARKS SYSTEMS PLANNING

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Director General, National Parks, Canadian Parks Service)(Chairman): I would like to welcome you all to Workshop "A" on Sustainable Development Through Parks Systems Planning. As you know, Sustainable Development is the overall theme of the conference, but this workshop will concentrate on parks system planning, per se, how it contributes to sustainable development and how sustainable development relates to parks systems planning.

I would just like to give you a little bit of background to the lead up to this workshop. I suppose we could go back to the appearance of the Brundtland Report some years ago which made recommendations for a tripling of protected areas in the world. Roughly 4% of the world's land area is set aside now or, at least, was at the time of that report. That kind of recommendation has been echoed by the IUCN which talks about setting aside 10% of our land areas in protected areas.

The World Wildlife Fund and the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society have embarked on a major campaign beginning about a year ago, called Endangered Spaces, which you are all familiar with as well as with the book and with the wilderness charter. They made a presentation at the Regina Conference of this group last year where we had some good exchange on the meaning of all these things for our various agencies.

As FPPC, we decided that it would be a good idea to hold a workshop on Systems Planning, which was sponsored by the CPS and held in Ottawa in December of last year. In fact, it was held back to back with a meeting of the wilderness caucus of the Canadian Environmental Network, an association of NGOs, and they had a representative at our meeting, and a number of the members who were at the FPPC Meeting also went to their meeting.

Around about the same time, the Federal Environmental Agenda, the Green Plan, got started. We talked about that earlier today. In fact, at the time of that meeting in December, the Federal Minister announced his commitment to the completion of the National Parks System and laid out some more specific commitments for development of national parks in the meantime.

That meeting agreed that there should be further workshops on systems planning to try to coordinate, in some way, what the various agencies are doing and so this workshop is really part of that process. This workshop, though, should focus more on the policy and philosophical level than on the technical planning level and there will be further technical planning workshops like the one held last December.

Park systems planning really is concerned with setting a rationale for network development and for setting priorities. It is concerned with new parks rather than with the management of existing parks although, obviously, the two are interrelated. Parks systems plans have one great advantage in that they tell the world, on both sides of the issue of parks, that we are talking about a finite system of parks, a finishable agenda, and I think that it is a great advantage for us, as managers of park systems, to have such finishable agendas.

Parks, though, are only part of the overall network of protected areas which we all envisage. There are many other forms, both public and private, and it is important to recognize that there are other players in this game, but that we have an important contribution to make. So, the aim of this workshop is to see what we can do to encourage a systematic approach, to explore different approaches and how they might be coordinated - and we represent agencies which have different approaches - and to discuss how parks systems planning contributes to sustainable development and how sustainable development considerations have a bearing on parks systems planning.

We have three panelists whom I will introduce now: Arlin Hackman from the World Wildlife Fund; Rick McCubbin from the Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland; and Ken McCleary from the Province of Ontario.

So, we have essentially three different perspectives here. We have a national perspective from the non-government side; someone from a province which has a highly-developed, systems-planning scheme and, in fact, are really in the implementation phase of that; and a representative from an association which is helping a province get started in the business of systems planning. So, I am going to be quite interested, myself, in hearing what each of those people has to say. They will each have 20 minutes to make a presentation and, if that works, we will have about half an hour or perhaps a bit more at the end for a general discussion on what we have heard.

So, without further ado, I would ask Arlin Hackman, from the World Wildlife Fund, to make his presentation.

PRESENTATION BY ARLIN HACKMAN

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): Thanks, Ian. It is my pleasure to be here, again, in Newfoundland and at FPPC.

The Wildlife Fund has certainly enjoyed the opportunity to work with parks agencies and other agencies in the conservation realm of government over the past year on this campaign, called Endangered Spaces. I want to make a few remarks, if time permits at the end of my comments, regarding the campaign and where it is headed, but, following Ian's opening, I do want to start off at a fairly philosophical level, really trying to help us think through our overall, strategic approach to taking advantage of sustainable development.

I think it is interesting to always look over our shoulder a little bit to see where we are coming from to gain perspective. Just over a year ago, in looking through some old conference materials, I discovered that the Director of Parks for Ontario at the time made this statement:

> "From the outset, I think that we should understand that wilderness is unlikely to become a fundamental, public-policy issue. The first reason is relatively simple, i.e. wildlands, as a broadly-based public issue, does not have the crisis characteristics which dominate major policy issues. The second reason relates to the fact that it is, essentially, a counter-culture concept."

Well, crisis or not, the Temagami controversy in Ontario is widely reported to have occupied more Cabinet time than any other issue addressed by the Peterson government. South Moresby and, more recently, Carmana also kept the lights burning late at night in both Ottawa and Victoria. How is this for counter-cultural rhetoric? And I quote:

> "Always conscious of the need to be economically responsible and considerate of future, economic development needs, governments, the private sector and the public at large must work cooperatively to establish a system of protected areas, including wilderness areas, ecological reserves, national parks, provincial parks, natural areas, wildlife refuges, to represent each of the 17 natural regions of Alberta by the year 2001, and the total area, thereby protected, should comprise at least 12% of the lands and waters of Alberta."

That resolution did not come from a band of dreamers in canoes, as a forest-industry acquaintance of both Norm and myself once described parks advocates. It was passed at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the Alberta Chamber of Commerce. What a difference a decade makes!

My aim here, of course, is not to revel in hindsight, but, instead, I want to emphasize that the operating environment for our work, if not our mission itself, has changed dramatically over the past ten years. I think that the energy regarding systems planning that has been evident in all the presentations so far today really reinforces that observation.

Globally, protecting wildlands and wildwaters is no longer perceived as a full-stomach phenomenon or a leisure-time option, but as a birthright and an ecological necessity. If our future plans are based on yesterday's realities and if we fail to articulate a parks vision, fueled by trends which are daily strengthening the mandate we have for protected areas, we are simply going to rob ourselves, as well as those who come after us, of, really, a once-only opportunity to protect our most fundamental natural resource, which is wild country. So, if we want to enter the 21st century with our parks systems contributing to the kind of world that we need to survive and a world that we are urgently groping to define through such concepts as sustainable development, then I think we have to firm up our strategy right now and plan accordingly. And to get very practical, with a pivotal meeting, in my view, of Parks Ministers quickly approaching, I do not think there is any time to lose in facing the future.

Wilderness, wild country, whatever you want to call our natural heritage, is a mainstream issue, if not a mainstream crisis, today and I think there is little doubt that, if we have ten years or eleven years or nine years, the time is short in which to do something about it.

In my view, linking our parks mission to sustainable development is critical to our success in meeting this challenge. Sustainable development really remains a slippery notion still, I think, in search of a distinct, measurable program, but it has already become institutionalized. It appears on office doors, letterheads, job descriptions, program plans, a host of new public forums and keynote addresses by world leaders. In other words, it is here to stay as a principle for reorganizing the nation's business and I think it falls very much to conservationists to ensure that, after the reorganization, we are not left with business as usual.

Parks agencies, in particular, have much to contribute to making sustainable development work in practical terms and, by the same token, much to lose if they do not tackle this challenge now while old mandates are being redefined, while new constituencies are emerging and while stakeholder allliances are shifting.

Let us quickly review the conservation argument for linking parks systems to sustainable development because that is, after all, what we are here about. This is familiar ground, I think, to most of you, if not all of us in the room, but it is basic and it is so basic that it really bears repetition.

At its core, the notion of sustainable development involves patterning human activity to maintain, rather than deplete, the world's living resources, our natural capital. In short, the challenge is to conserve biological diversity. Now, of course, a minor contribution is made to this goal by zoos and in test tubes, but, really, the only cost-effective way to conserve biological diversity is to protect the integrity of natural ecosystems.

For this, I think, we need a two-pronged approach to the total landscape. On the one hand, we need to apply strict conservation practices to lands and waters that are allocated to development so as to maintain their long-term productivity. That is where I think there is, legitimately, a lot of activity in the conservation community focusing on improved practices in the forestry, agriculture and fisheries industries.

On the other hand, we also need a system of protected areas that span the entire range of natural ecosystems. In these areas, management is dedicated to ensuring that complex ecological processes, including the natural selection of wild species, continue to operate.

Canada's parks systems hold great promise for protecting natural ecosystems in support of sustainable development. They tend to secure relatively large sites from industrial development or well-financed relative to other types of reserves or established with long-term commitments and, increasingly, they embody the aim of ecological representation. Of course, I have to say, in the same breath, that many other types of protected areas also have a role to play, including ecological reserves, wildlife areas, tribal parks and sites secured through private stewardship. But, at the end of all this, I think that there is no doubt that parks agencies have a particular leadership responsibility in the conservation world.

Both prongs of the two-pronged strategy, improved resource management and protected areas, must be closely coordinated for ecological as well as social reasons. In the former case, ecological reasons, the protected areas can only serve as ecological reservoirs for the rural landscape if the use of adjacent lands permits the dispersion of their ecological benefits, hence, the need, for example, for corridors and buffer zones and to designate concepts of designation and land status that are very quickly rising in importance in the menu of conservation programs. Conversely, protected areas will lose their integrity if they are hemmed in by land uses which fragment ecological processes operating at a larger scale than the protected area.

Overall, I guess the ideal is really a pattern of land use which grades from extensive to intensive use from the center of protected areas to the periphery, by employing a range of conservation designations.

In the social realm, the other reason for coordinating these two prongs, protected areas will only survive if they are supported by people living and working nearby, thereby minimizing the pressure for incompatible uses within the protected area. That support will only be forthcoming if local residents feel some ownership and benefit from the protected areas, so parks managers must establish good working relations with nearby commuities and link decisions for these reserves with decisions for the surrounding areas.

This very brief analysis is firmly rooted, I think, in field experience from around the world and detailed in a host of recent publications, conferences, proceedings, etc. One, in particular, that I might point to, which I just received and which I think is a really solid compendium, is this thing called, "Conserving the World's Biological Diversity", which comes to us from the World Bank, the World Resources Institute, IUCN, the Conservation International and the World Wildlife Fund.

Here at home, Canada's national conservation organizations have expressed their consensus on the two-pronged approach to both federal and provincial governments. I include in that coalition the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, Nature Conservancy, ourselves, etc., all the major, national non-government, conservation organizations that, very explicitly and repeatedly, stress the need for this two-pronged approach in dealings with the governments of the day.

The issue here then, in this forum today, is how parks agencies take advantage of this international experience and the constituency support that exists to put the analysis into action so as to consolidate the position of protected areas in the national commitment to sustainable development. I have a few suggestions to make in that regard, again, really, at the strategic level.

First of all, I think we need to update the public image of parks from that of amenity to ecological necessity. Nationally, I think it is still true to say that parks are identified very much as scenic playgrounds, attractive but not necessarily urgent to decision makers. Such a profile confines parks and protected areas to the sidelines and decisions on land use and budget priorities.

To turn this situation around, I think we need to do a better job of documenting the ecological benefits of protected areas and registering them in the national accounts. For example, I think it would be instructive to be able to estimate the replacement costs of the environmental services provided by some of our parks. We know how many acres we have in a system. Although we are still always struggling to get precise counts on those, we generally can figure out how many miles of roads we have and how much of a cost was involved in building them.

But how about the cost of replacing the supplies of clean water, clean air, local climate stabilization and wildlife which protected areas yield? This might be worthy of a case study by FPPC at some point. But, beyond such a project, of course, we also need to focus management goals for protected areas for our parks and the action to achieve them, more precisely, on maintaining the ecological integrity of protected areas, and to minimize disturbance from human exploitation.

Second, and equally important, really, if not more important, we have to give substance to the image of parks as we need to repaint it - the image of parks is biological reservoirs - by the way in which we locate them and draw their boundaries. Here, of course, I am talking about the actual design and implementation of a parks system.

In other words, we have to develop parks systems plans to achieve the goal of protecting our range of natural ecosystems.

In the past, park systems - and I am oversimplifying here, obviously - have been built up largely on an ad hoc basis by designating the unusual or the spectacular and drawing borders which reflect visual or administrative or social considerations much more so than ecological ones. Recent advances in conservation biology and landscape ecology, I think, technically support the shift in emphasis that I am calling for.

For this purpose, we need to complete the map of Canada's natural regions and set targets for representing those regions through protected areas so that we know where and how much of the landscape needs protective status. Many jurisdictions in Canada are advancing well on this front, but several have yet to define or confirm their natural regions and still more - I think six, to be precise - have yet to set measurable targets for representation.

Further, there is a need to rationalize natural region boundaries across political borders and to elaborate representation targets more scientifically than sort of the rule of thumb of one park per region which is, typically, the target we have now.

In my view, the Federal-Provincial Parks Council could help in pulling together a coherent map of natural regions for the country based on the input of each jurisdiction. This means, first of all, encouraging some jurisdictions to produce their first maps. It also means linking up the natural region boundaries across provincial or territorial borders and confirming the scale of analysis at which representation targets are set.

FPPC could also provide leadership in refining the representation criteria or standards. As systems plans evolve and pressure on the land base intensifies, I think more attention will focus on the issue of what constitutes adequate representation. The mere presence or absence of a protected area will not suffice as an answer in those circumstances. FPPC could help parks agencies prepare for this discussion and I think some very useful headway has already been made, particularly by Ontario's Life Signs framework and Alberta's Matrix approach to measuring representation.

In general, I think that each natural region should ideally have at least one major ecosystem reserve, such as a national or provincial park, selected to include the spectrum of habitat types characteristic of the natural region. The boundaries should be large enough to ensure that the ecological processes of the protected area are maintained, along with - in many cases where this is still possible - minimum, viable populations of characteristic plant and animal species. For example, ideally, arboreal forest reserves should be able to withstand the occurrence of wildfire.

In reality, one protected area will often not suffice to meet representation objectives, let alone other legitimate conservation objectives, and so parks agency should identify their role as one of many agencies in contributing to a full menu of protected areas within each natural region. Parks agencies also, I think, should establish a cooperative working relationship with other agencies that have a contribution to make. Generally, this is going to involve parks taking responsibility for reserving large representative sites and other agencies filling in with different categories or reserves to protect, for example, special habitats, unique features or culturally significant sites.

Thirdly, I think park agencies need to work diligently to promote the two-pronged approach and the natural region framework within their departments and governments as the basis for conservation strategies to achieve sustainable development and as a basis for a finishable agenda for protected area systems.

Fourthly, the only way that a critical, massive effort will be reached to get the job done to complete park systems is for governments to set clear systems goals and timetables. I know this puts agencies and Ministers on the spot, but it is as simple as that. Each of us has to set goals and schedules to achieve our own personal agendas and I think the same rule applies to agencies. As long as governments do not have target dates set, parks system plans are in danger of remaining just that, plans.

I think this is, obviously, not a simple boot-strap operation and this is where partnerships with other non-government agencies really come into play. In my view, the upcoming Parks Ministers' Meeting is a really important opportunity to build awareness at the political level regarding the points I have covered briefly. Further, I think it should be used to confirm that Parks Ministers, themselves, see a leadership role for their agencies in contributing to sustainable development. So, I have some suggested principles that, I think, would be important to put before Ministers at the meeting and I will just read quickly through these in closing.

The first one would be that the conservation of biological diversity is a fundamental prerequisite for achieving the goal of sustainable development.

Two, the conservation of biological diversity, through the protection of natural ecosystems, is an urgent priority because species loss is irreversible and habitat retention is more cost effective than habitat restoration. I think Canada's unique opportunity, in this regard, should be noted as well. We still can accomplish what most countries of the world have lost the opportunity to do in protecting natural systems.

Three, we need a two-pronged approach to guide jurisdictions in managing lands and waters to protect the ecological integrity of the landscape. I mentioned already the two-prongs in that.

Four, park systems have a major contribution to make to the network of ecologically-representative, protected areas and the goal of completing such a network should be incorporated in the conservation strategy for each jurisdiction.

Five, each jurisdiction should set its own measurable goals and timetable for parks system planning, including targets for natural region representation. Site selection and park establishment to meet the park system goals should be conducted with public participation, including the opportunity for local residents to help in choosing which sites will be designated in their respective natural regions. This is fundamental. I think, strategically, we need to make the commitments and the timetables and then respond to legitimate needs for local flexibility by enabling the people, resident and with interest in the local area, to identify the best candidate within a natural region. So, the commitment is fixed, but the means of achievement is sensitive to local needs.

Six, natural region representation by protected areas, including parks, should be achieved by the year 2000. This is a goal to be shared by a variety of public and private conservation agencies.

Seven, the Federal, Provincial and Territorial Parks Conference should serve as a forum for developing systems planning standards and building a cooperative, systems-planning effort across the country, which links public and private conservation initiatives.

I think, at that point, I have additional remarks which I prepared regarding the Endangered Spaces Campaign. I would be happy to answer any questions that you have on our work and our future plans, but I will leave off at this point so that we can leave the maximum time for questions. Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Arlin, you have given us some food for thought. Now, I know that Rick wants to use some slides.

PRESENTATION BY RICK McCUBBIN

PROTECTED AREAS ASSOCIATION

MR. R. McCUBBIN (Protected Areas Association, Newfoundland and Labrador): Thanks very much, Ian. If I had had time, I would have given a biographical sketch to the moderator, but I guess we never really had the time to talk before we came in. I sort of wear two hats in regard to the speech that I will be giving today. I work with the Environmental Protection of Environment-Canada here in St. John's and I am also on the Board of Directors of the Protected Areas Association. It will be in the latter capacity, I guess, that I will be talking today.

What I would like to do today, basically, is just perhaps profile the Protected Areas Association's efforts within the province of Newfoundland to established a Protected Areas Program by 1992. Before I get into the actual association, though, I think that a bit of background may be in order for our out-of-province guests.

We have had a piece of legislation in this province, called the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act, of which you may have heard through plenary, but I am not sure. It has been around since the beginning of 1980 and, when it was first passed, it was considered by many to be one of the strongest pieces of legislation for creating protected areas in Canada. It is a very strong piece of legislation. Once an area is protected under WERA, the lands are protected from any form of development, including mining, logging and hydro-electric projects. It involves a lot of public involvement and the beauty of it is that, once a reserve has been established under this program, it cannot be changed without similar, extensive, public consultation. So, in many ways, it is a very good piece of legislation.

I guess the problem is that, in spite of this exemplary legislation, its success has been somewhat dubious in that only one new reserve has been fully established under that piece of legislation since it was passed. Most of the other reserves that we have had are consolidation of others and have come under legislation that has been around since the mid-1960's. That has left Newfoundland in the unenviable position of being a province with one of the worst track records in thw country for parks or reserve systems in terms of our total land-based protection, roughly less than 1%.

There are a number of reasons for this; perhaps the two most fundamental are, basically, the lack of public support at a grassroots level and the synergism with the lack of political support that that creates. In terms of the last provincial election held in this province, environmental issues were not even on the political agenda at that time and it is probably one of the few places in Canada where you can have a provincial election and not have environmental issues upfront.

A number of people would probably recognize this schematic put out under The Endangered Spaces Program. They basically ask four questions: Are ecological regions mapped? Are park targets set for these regions? Are they Cabinet approved? And is the systems plan complete? Well, Newfoundland is the only province in Canada that would have to admit to a no to all of those with the exception of P.E.I. and the Northwest Territories. It is my understanding that they are attacking this from a different perspective, probably through their conservation strategies.

So, the need, as mentioned earlier, is less than 1%. I think that has changed recently since we have had the debate in Nordville(ph) in this area added to the list of protected areas, so it is probably up around 2% - this was written slightly before that - but it does not give us that enviable record in Newfoundland. And two-thirds of the land that is protected in this province happens to fall within our national parks system.

We heard earlier that, through the UN's World Commission on Environment and Development, they have suggested that countries strive for at least 12% of their land base to be set aside in a network of natural protected areas. There are other mechanisms within the province for doing that, but, as you will see later in my talk, the problem with that is that they do not give long-term land protection. It is short-term at best and it can be changed subject to the winds of politicians, other than the WER Act.

As we also heard earlier, natural resource experts agree that time is running out of the hourglass. We figure that, by the year 2000, resource depletion, including that of Newfoundland, will make it much more difficult to protect these land bases, so the time to act is now.

Currently, the public's awareness of the state of the province's wilderness is low. Generally speaking, Newfoundlanders have this feeling that there is an abundance of wilderness out there and it is unfortunate. It is probably because a lot of areas in Newfoundland are somewhat inaccessible, but that does not mean that there is no logging and mining exploration, etc. going on.

As I said, the province needs to move quickly to establish a reserve system. The first step that the Protected Areas Association sees as being required is to build support for a systems plan through the development of a Natural Regions Definition Study and nominations of candidate reserves. Within this province, we are basically started from ground zero. We have to, first of all, identify the natural eco regions that we have in the province and catalogue those and, secondly, we have to look at and, in some way, systemize, under one cover, the type of land protection that we have. So, we are basically starting, as I said, from the ground up.

The other major role that we see is having to develop this broad-based public, corporate, political and bureaucratic support for the protection of the land base. As the Brundtland Commission noted, law alone cannot enforce the common interest; it needs community knowledge and support at the basic level.

So, enter the Protected Areas Association. We were formed in the summer of 1989. We have not been around for very long, but you will see, as my talk progresses, that we have managed to get a fair number of initiatives launched in that time. We had an official launching at Bowring Park here in St. John's. There was a bit of hype behind it, where the media and the politicians came, and this sort of kicked us off to get us going. The goal of the Association is to ensure that the natural heritage of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador is maintained in a system of protected areas by the year 2000.

The strategy of the Protected Areas Association is basically three-pronged. First of all, it will involve the creation of a Protected Areas Systems Plan by the year 1992; secondly, the adoption of this plan by the provincial Cabinet, hopefully, by the end of 1992; and, finally, also the development of widespread, public support and advocacy for natural areas conservation across the province which, generally, we do not have right now.

In terms of staff and structure, the PAA is staffed by a full-time Executive Director, who is just leaving us, so we are in search of a new Executive Director. We also have an office manager and various research consultants who are working on different parts of the systems plan. We, basically, have 50 full-time members and about 600 individuals who are on our mailing list at present.

We are a non-governmental, non-profit organization with starting funding from the World Wildlife Fund and the Wilderness Society of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have also had quite a lot of generous donations in kind from different professional services to keep us going. So, to date, we have been sort of running on a barebones kind of budget, a wing and a prayer and a lot of good intentions by a lot of the professional people in this province. We have broad-based support by a lot of social and environmental groups from across the province as well as national and international organizations.

We have undertaken initiatives to work in association, both with the provincial and federal governments, in the province to achieve these common objectives relating to implementation of sustainable development practices. We feel that our approach is somewhat different than in a lot of the provinces where the systems planning is actually done by government. We feel that, as an NGO, we can sort of bridge the gap between the government's environmental agenda and the public's interests. It is a little bit more non-partisan, I suppose.

Basically, the immediate aim of the organization, as I mentioned earlier, is to develop a citizens-supported systems plan by 1992. To develop this plan, we see, basically, three steps happening.

First of all, we have to define and map the province's natural regions. This is a study that is being completed right now by a consultant and, if I have time, I will give you a quick overview of what that is going to look like.

Secondly, we have to identify mechanisms for protection of the current areas already protected under *different land protection* designations. That is another study that is being done by a consultant in consultation with our Provincial Parks Department, and that report is in draft stage undergoing peer review.

And, finally, we have to identify and nominate the candidate areas for protection.

These three steps will require the involvement and input from experts and local residents from across Newfoundland. Overseeing this consultation will, basically, be three committees: an Expert Advisory Committee, a Systems Planning Committee and a Candidate Areas Committee. Simultaneously, we see the need to develop public awareness about the need for natural areas conservation of the province and to this end, we are going to be developing a public communications plan and a public education program to try to educate and foster advocacy within the public for natural areas protection.

And in 1990-91, we are trying to launch an attitude survey towards wilderness in the province in order to get a feel for what the public's attitude is and develop an economic-impact study looking at the economic impact of protecting the natural areas in the province.

So, the objectives of the program, basically, as I said, are: (1) defining the natural areas and developing a systems plan of candidate reserve-nominations for protection, which will actually be done in conjunction with the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council and the Provincial Parks Division; and (2) to develop support at all levels for the system of protected areas in the province through public, group and government adoption of its *plan by 1992.*

Basically, we see these objectives being met in a three-phase program. Phase 1 is the phase that we are currently in right now. It involved the official launching of the PAA, the establishment of this Expert Advisory Committee and the establishment further of a Systems Planning Committee. The Systems Planning Committee is responsible for developing the first two studies that will become components of the systems plan. This is the Natural Regions Definition Plan and the Protected Areas Study. The Candidate Areas Nomination Committee has been formed and we hope, later in the year, to launch the Attitudes Survey and the planning of Education and Consultation Programs with the public.

The second phase, which will start next year and run through 1991, is, basically, a phase of education and public consultation and reserve nominations, once we have established those nominations, getting into the development of Labrador programs - the Labrador phase of the PAA's agenda will come about a year later - and the establishment of public education and advocacy programs.

The third phase is the adoption and implementation phase where, basically, we have the systems plan that has had public input into it and we forward that to government for their consideration and, hopefully, have it endorsed by Cabinet by the end of 1992.

I would just like to say a little bit about the two studies that we have launched because they are integral to the development of the systems plan. The Natural Regions Definition Study is being done by Susan Metis(ph), a botanist in the province, who has done some recent work in the ecosystem definition. She has quite a broad command of this entire literature, so she was a natural to launch this study. Now, we are hoping that her draft report, which I will profile quickly in a minute, should be ready sometime later this month.

The other one, Presently-Protected Studies Area, is the study that was done with the Parks Division. We felt that, to start off, we really needed to take a comprehensive look at the various types of land protection that we have in the province now, a quantification of the types of land that fall into those categories and a good mapping system of those areas. So, this study is almost complete and is undergoing peer review at the present as well.

If you were to try to graphically represent this process that I have been talking about, this is an early draft of how we see it going, basically, (1) trying to establish a base on which to build, defining what ecoregions we have in the province and in Labrador, which has not been done to date, amazingly, and (2) identifying what areas of protected land we have now.

The Candidate Nominations Committee will have to then establish preservation criteria, which is being worked on at present, and this will be input into the systems plan. The concepts behind the systems plan or exactly what the systems plan will entail is still under development and the Systems Planning Committee is hoping by the early fall to have a draft of the systems plan together. Basically, we will receive input from the public. At the same time we will be trying to develop this advocacy process with the public by launching these attitude surveys and economic impact studies and, eventually, both public input and systems planning input will go into government. Again, there is an advocacy rule to play with government so that we can, hopefully, get formal adoption by Cabinet for the plan by 1992.

The next slide is basically to show you how we are trying to get this together. To date, the Protective Areas Association is so new that we felt that we really needed to get a higher profile within the public of the province and we are going to try to launch a publication, hopefully, by the end of the fall. That is, basically, what we see going into it by the World Wildlife Fund, the Wilderness Society, the Minister of Environment and Lands and then, basically, basically outlining the need, who we are, what our program is all about, planning for natural areas, a condensation of the Presently-Protected Areas Study, a description of the natural regions, the selection criteria and, finally, the systems plan. So, we are hoping to get all this under one cover in the very near future, so that the public will start to recognize who we are.

We talked about the Protected Areas Atlas earlier. This is one of the studies that is just being tabled now and one that was done with the Provincial Parks Division. As I said earlier, it will outline the various types of protected area categories we now have in the province that are constituent types. The report will then quantify the amounts of land - in this case, they are the wilderness and ecological reserves that we have at present. This is the land base behind the reserves and then, subsequently, in the report, there will be a detailed description of each one, giving some descriptive information on each one of the wilderness areas or Crown land reserves, etc.

Finally, there is something like a map. This is what is holding the study up right now, i.e. trying to get good quality maps and we are working with provincial parks to do that for each one of these. So, that is the point of view of the protected areas inventory.

The other ongoing study that is just about completed, as well, is a Natural Regions Report. This is, basically, an outline of what that report will look like. I understand that it is going to be quite a substantial piece of work, about 300 pages. It will describe the methods that we use, the general and physical descriptions of the province along with geology and climate maps. It will then describe the flora and fauna, ecoregion descriptions for, first of all, Newfoundland and Labrador, then the marine natural regions and coastal regions. And this is an amazing piece of work in itself given that, hitherto, we have never had any detailed descriptions under one cover of the various ecoregions that we have to work with in the province. So, until you get have something as fundamental as your ecoregions defined, it is pretty hard to launch a systems plan.

This is, basically, what I will start off with as a map of the island, part of the island where the different ecoregions have been defined by the ecological groundwork. There will then be a description of the forest communities by ecoregion and a matrix of what vegetation occurs by each ecoregion.

If we were to use the Western Newfoundland ecoregion, first, as an example, it will start with some basic descriptions of its topography, elevation, climate, vegetation and flora and fauna. It will then describe community structure in relation to topography and climate for each of these ecoregions. There will be a further description of the location of the ecoregion, its physical and climatic conditions, the vegetation that one might find in that particular area, a description of recognized sub-regions that may be contained within each of the major ecoregions and a description that, basically, gets into the fauna.

A lot of this work is extremely interesting to people in the province because a lot of it is quite novel. There has never been an attempt to describe the marine natural regions in the province and this is the first time, through this contract, that a consultant got together a bunch of marine scientists and said, "Hey, guys, you know, we have quite a lot of water surrounding this island, a lot of different ecosystem types; how about coming to grips and trying to tell us how you would define one from the other in terms of different natural regions?" And they have actually been able to reach some sort of consensus on this. Those are the different natural marine regions that have been agreed upon and, if you were to map it, it would look something like this. Considering that this work had never been done before and we only started last fall, I think that considerable progress has been made to date.

I did not really get into addressing the systems plan, specifically, for two reasons. I, basically, wanted to get the message out about the PAA and what we are doing in general. I had a lot of ground to cover, as you can see. I have brought along Dr. Bill Need Need(ph) of the Canadian Forestry Service, who is the

Chairman of our Systems Planning Committee. If there are specific questions abut the systems plan or if you would like Bill to give you a quick overview of what we see going into it, I will give you that choice. He is at your disposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Rick. You may be late off the mark, but it looks like you are going to end up ahead of the pack. There is clearly a lot of work to be done and a lot has been done. Maybe we will draw on some of your expertise.

Now, I would like to hear from Ken McCleary from Ontario, who will tell us what Ontario is up to.

PRESENTATION BY MR. KEN McCLEARY

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

MR. K. McCLEARY (Province of Ontario): Thank you, Ian. As presented at many earlier Federal-Provincial Parks Council Meetings, Ontario's parks system has recently gone through a period of expansion and policy refinement. In 1983, the government endorsed a recommendation that 155 new parks be added to the system and then, in 1989, the final 51 additions were regulated and protected under the Parks Act.

The system now has 261 regulated provincial parks and more than six milllion hectares of lands and waters. During that same time, a new protection-oriented program, called Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, was launched and the ANSI Program, as we call it, encompasses another 564 provincially significant areas which incorporate earth and life science features of provincial significance, which are representative of Ontario's natural diversity. ANSIs are distributed across Ontario on both public and private lands and these are the focus of a great deal of our program's attention at the moment in trying to secure their protection.

This expansion of the parks system and creation of the new ANSI Program was intimately linked to the overall Ministry Land-Use Planning Program, which took a long time to complete. Within that context, the Ministry put the pressure on the various programs, including parks, fisheries, wildlife, forestry, minerals, Crown-land recreation, tourism, cottaging, all the programs that the Ministry deals with, to come up with goals and objectives and appropriate allocations and resource management policies.

Back in 1972, the competition for resources, at that time, was recognized as very intense, in that we were starting to lose our opportunities to make resource allocations. At that time, it was recognized and I remember the Deputy Minister of the day saying, "We are getting close to the back of the farm for resource allocation." We were not able to carry on in the way that we had done in the past, whereby ad hoc decisions about resource use were being made across the province at a district level. It just was not practical to conduct our business in that way.

While this process did take a long time, from 1972 on into the '80's, the strategic plan approach, coupled with the systems planning that we did, proved to be fairly successful for the parks program. And there were four primary reasons for that success.

First of all, the parks program had a government-approved goal of four objectives: protection, recreation, heritage appreciation and tourism for the parks system. It also had a park classification system with six classes of parks: wilderness, nature reserve, historical, natural environment, waterway and recreation class parks. We had nine broad management principles and planning guidelines which, basically, adopted a systems approach to parks system planning.

These ideas seem fairly straight forward today. I think the fact that they were government endorsed proved to be most valuable to us in the allocation-negotiation process with all the other players in the strategic, land-use game. They all did not have explicit mandates, which were government approved, as we did.

The second main factor which was attributed to our success was that there was recognition, politically, that strategic, land-use planning and systems planning together were essential for solving these major resource allocation issues. The Minister of the day recognized the importance of finalizing the debate and making those decisions. At a critical moment, he imposed a two-year time frame for us to complete the process, which included an extensive, public-consultation program.

The third main factor was that there was strong, organized support from parks system advocates who recognized that this process was perhaps the best and perhaps the last opportunity to accomplish major, parks system objectives. Under the name Parks for Tomorrow, groups such as the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, the Algonquin Wildlands League and others banded together and worked very effectively to provide input, both at a technical and at a political level, which was valuable for us.

The fourth factor, of course, is a very dedicated parks staff who recognized the planning opportunity and the stakes involved associated with this.

From a more technical, systems planning perspective, the program defined explicit targets - and I cannot emphasize too much that they were explicit targets - and a set of standards which, essentially, set out the limits of the parks system.

The province was divided into 13 forest-site regions and a subset of 65 site districts, which were primarily based on climatic differentiation, physiography and vegetation. Within that broad context, the systems planning framework prescribed park distribution targets. The systems plan calls for one representative-wilderness park and one complementary-wilderness zone in each of our broad site regions. Each site district should be represented by one natural-environment-class park. The third major category was that each site district should be traversed by a waterway-class park.

In addition to that, thematic targets were also derived for a system of 44 provincially-significant, earth science scenes with approximately a thousand features and the results of a life-science system, which tries to capture the ecologic and species diversity of the province associated with approximately 2,000 potential environments.

If these features were not found in those three classes of parks that I mentioned, natural environment, wilderness or waterway, those features were to become comparatively smaller, nature-reserve parks and thus we would be able to capture the natural diversity of any region or district and, ultimately, the province.

As I mentioned, we have four objectives. Those are the protection-oriented ones, but we also had ones which were related to historical representation within the parks system; 13 broad themes and 115 theme segments were identified.

We also established explicit, recreation targets which were allocated to each region for back-country-wilderness travel, car camping, swimming and picnicking. The basis for establishing the recreation targets were opportunities per capita and expected population growth in resident and non-resident markets. And then we used a very technically-complicated, computer-supply, allocation model in order to assign those targets. There is only one person in our branch, I think, who understands that.

At any rate, with those explicit targets, our regional planners and our earth-and-life-science specialists began the evaluation of our existing parks and the search for new park candidates. These are then introduced into the district and regional, land-use plans and then, after the public consultation process was over, this was concluded by introducing the conclusions into a set of district, land-use guidelines which were released in the legislature in 1983 by the Minister.

Overall, the parks system did beat a fairly high proportion of the distribution targets set out for it, but there are significant shortfalls as well. We do have 9 of 11 site regions with wilderness parks. The new parks added to the system, at that time, were Woodland Caribou, Wabikimi(ph), Kasagami(ph), Lady Evan Smooth Water, which is in the news in association with the Temagami issue, Opasquia(ph) and we also had an expansion to Killarney Provincial Park.

Fifty-five out of sixty-five site districts have natural-environment-class parks or are equivalent in zones in other park classes. In waterways, we only have 29 out of 65 districts with waterway parks. From a thematic perspective, our parks protect 49% of the earth-science features and 46% of the life-science ones. So, we did not do quite as well in terms of the thematic aspects. That is the role where areas of natural and scientific interest play a major part; 25% of the earth-science features are found within areas of natural and scientific interest and 39% of the life science is landscapes. It is those remaining targets, though, that really represent the challenge for us in the future in systems planning.

In response to endangered spaces, the 12% challenge, parks constitute about 6% of the province's land base, but, if we were to add other areas, such as national parks, the adequately protected areas of natural and scientific interests, conservation authority holdings, exclusions in our timber management process, park commission lands and others, we would probably be upwards in the order of 8%. Whether or not that type of an approach, which goes beyond parks, would satisfy World Wildlife Fund expectations, that is, obviously, open for debate and discussion.

Another way of looking at the question of adequacy is to ask whether or not protected areas represent the full range of the province's natural diversity. We have a way to go in that regard because our system is not complete; however, opportunities still remain, particularly in the north, where we have not completed the district, land-use plans. In the south, we are going to be reliant on cooperative initiatives with federal and provincial and conservation authorities and private landowners.

With that in mind, the branch now is working on a protected areas strategy and this will focus on those remaining gaps, i.e. what we need also to do with respect to areas of natural and scientific interest, and also it will be working towards completing the work on ecological reserves that Norm mentioned earlier this morning.

What does all this mean for sustainable development in our case, which is part of the main conference theme? The representative protected areas that are found within the parks system and in areas of natural and scientific interest will play a significant role in sustainable development in Ontario. At present, the Ministry is kind of shifting its emphasis and reorganizing its goals and objectives and management principles, and sustainable development is central to that reorganization. To use the Ministry terms, it tends to be the lead conservation agency in Ontario and protection of provincially-significant, natural heritage is a clear corporate objective. The elements of natural diversity, as defined by us in the parks system, will be central to that objective.

In our case, we see that parks and protected areas can be viewed as one end of the development spectrum. While comparatively small, they do have some special significance for sustainable development. For the most part, they will be unmanipulated, representative landscapes. The parks, particularly, can provide low-intensity, recreation activities, which are environmentally compatible and, as a result, will contribute to economic benefits arising from tourism. Some of our parks, areas of natural and scientific interest and, in future, our ecological reserves will be storehouses of knowledge available for research on how natural systems function and also for monitoring environmental change. They will act as gene pools that protect and represent elements of natural diversity. They will also be focal points for education and appreciation of the natural environment.

In a resource-management context and in resource-management circles, they should serve as ecological benchmarks suitable for comparisons with landscapes which are managers of resource production or more intense forms of sustainable development. All those themes are well developed in the Manitoba paper and I think we are in support of those, but the key to the role of parks and protected areas within sustainable development is that they are accepted as legitimate land uses within that much broader land-use framework, which includes protected areas, areas managed within an acceptable and environmentally-caring capacities and developed areas. They are not just amenity areas left over after the allocation process. This is a point that Arlin was making.

We have a lot of work to do if we are going to serve that utilitarian role in enforcing sustainable development in our parks. We will have to do a lot more work on environmental inventories; related research on how natural systems work; environmental monitoring; exemplary, protection-oriented, resource management; and interpretation.

Also, we are going to have to come to grips, finally, with the struggle between protection and tourism that we have been working at, particularly in the north, where new parks and protected areas are intertwined with the traditional, tourist industry and with native interests.

Another factor, in the future, is that our park managers will need to receive broader training in the science aspects of managing park resources. This will be over and above, of course, the annual complexities of serving 8 million customers with more demand in recreational and educational tastes.

One of the key things of where we are at in the stage of our system work is that we are going to have to develop more cooperative efforts and involve more partnerships and this will take place in a variety of ways. Norm mentioned this morning in his comments the work with the Natural Heritage League, which is an organization of 31 members all working towards the protection of natural areas. We can see that more partnerships along those lines will be strategic in our affairs.

Another thing that is happening is that we will be working more with municipalities in trying to achieve parks-systems-protection objectives. We have done quite a bit of that in the past and it carries on in the present. For example, some years ago, we worked closely with the Niagara Escarpment Commission to identify all the significant natural features. Currently, we are working in Muskoka in identifying natural areas which require protection in a revised regional plan that they are working on.

In a similar vein, the province or the Department of Municipal Affairs is working on something called Greening of the Planning Act and, right within that, they were talking about placing greater emphasis on environmental protection and also areas of natural and scientific interest. They are also talking about placing more emphasis on protection of wetlands and doing this in a sustainable way.

One of the objects of the conference is to provide a set of park planning principles and Ian has been leading a group to work on those, but, from our perspective, there are several ideas which do emerge, which I think are important. We have been served very well by the fact that we had government-endorsed, goal objectives and explicit targets. And I want to stress explicit targets. It was within that context that we were able to establish a systems plan.

Secondly, one of the keys in our system is that representation of natural and cultural diversity is the primary organizing concept and there is an end to the system and we are looking forward to representing the natural diversity.

The third point that I would like to mention is that public involvement in formulating both the broad policy and also program-implementation strategies at the park level is necessary in order to build both support and acceptance by both parks and protected-area advocates, but also the other resource users who are within those communities. In terms of our own evolution, we see more and more that coordination and development of partnerships for achieving that network of protected areas will be essential to the planning and management process.

I would be pleased to answer any questions.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ken. That is the end of the formal presentations. We have had a lot of food for thought. I would now open the floor for questions and I would include in that questions from panel members to each other or, if they would like to make some further comments, based on what they heard from their confrères, that would be cricket too.

One of the questions that has always intrigued me, if I could lead off with a question, and I am not sure to whom to address it, but it has to do with this question of detail and the definition of natural regions. We had some discussion on this a year ago, but it seems clear to me that there is a certain amount of arbitrariness in how, finally, you choose to make your subdivisions. I noticed, Rick, that you were talking about subregions and that kind of terminology tends to get used. But it seems to me that we need some kind of common understanding of what level of detail we should be aiming for because it does seem to vary enormously from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Now, of course, there are natural things driving that, but there should be some overall rationale, it seems to me, too and I have never heard anyone discuss that. So, if any of you want to take that on, I would be happy to listen.

MR. R. McCUBBIN (Newfoundland and Labrador): Bill, did you want to handle that one? You have done some pioneering work on ecoregion definitions in Labrador; to what extent would you consider ecoregion definitions to be hard science versus professional judgment?

MR. W. NEED (Canadian Forestry Service and Chairman, Systems Planning Committee, Newfoundland and Labrador): I guess the methodology and the basic principle that we are using in Newfoundland and Labrador are very similar to what is outlined in the Eco-Climatic Regions of Canada publications put out by the Sustainable Development Branch, the forerunners of the Lands

Director. So, the principles there have been applied in vegetation ecology for almost a hundred years, i.e. you look at the modal-site-drainage species composition and compare it from one area to another until it changes. If you assume that the soils, the bedrock geology and the drainage systems are equivalent, the changes are soon to be climatic. So, an ecoregion is, basically, a vegetation bioassay of climate. When we look at an ecoregion, that is what we are looking at.

In regard to the sub-regions, I do not know if anyone has put a formal definition on them. From Newfoundland and Labrador, it works on the basis of physiographic variation within so-called climatic ecoregions. So, you would be looking at gross changes in bedrock geology or, in some cases, the dominance in the landscape of certain features. If there is a specific change in the wetlands or the upland-forest species composition brought about by disturbance, etc., that may be relegated to a sub-region.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): The term "sustainable development" is new to me and I think I understand the concept we are working with, but I am curious about the origin or the derivation of the term. It sounds like an economics term. I wonder if it is limited to some kind of a park context or whether it is broader than that. Just where did it come from and what does it mean?

CHAIRMAN: I believe it was popularized, if not invented, by the World Commission on Environment Economy, the so-called Brundtland Report, and it was a concept they fixed on as one around which both conservationists and developers could rally and see both sides of the picture, but it may of started earlier than that. Does anyone else care to comment on that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As far as I recollect, Ian, I think you are right. That is the main origin of it, but it does have a wide variety of interpretations depending on whom you talk to. I think its origins are probably economic originally, but the environmental community certainly has picked up on it and, from our perspective, I think we are defining a very discreet role within that much broader context for our own parks system. Parks are one end of that sustainable development spectrum. Then there are areas where resource management activity does occur within acceptable, environmental-caring capacities and then developed areas would be a third, very broad category.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): (off-mike)(inaudible). . .To my knowledge, the term is not in vogue; however, it is certainly not the way it sounds.

CHAIRMAN: No, it is kind of curious how it has become kind of a buzz word in Canada. Some people favour that for the reasons that I mentioned, because various people can buy into it, but, because of its fuzzy definition and because of its use by one side against the other, some people regret that currency. But I think it is a useful concept, by and large, and the only dificulty that it causes for parks people is that it risks opening the door to those who talk about extensive multiple use within parks and economic development within parks. That is really, I think, where the two-pronged approach that Arlin and others talk about comes from.

Are there any other questions for the panel?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Rick, you outline what I consider to be a textbook process to systems planning. I think you are doing it the proper way, but you have mainly outlined it from a provincial perspective. You are a provincial organization and you are trying to build up a constituency out there. But when you get down to dealing with the individual candidates and dealing with public consultation and trying to gender up that advocacy at the local level, how do you plan on doing that as a provincial group? Do you have chapters out there locally that are going to try to build that constituency? Because many of us are facing the same problem. We are fine provincially, but, when it gets down to the work in the trenches with the individual projects, sometimes you are going to face the backlash because you are the provinical guys coming in from the capital to try to lay a heavy on the local people.

MR. R. McCUBBIN (Newfoundland and Labrador): It is a liability pitfall that we are certainly aware of and we do not want to be perceived to be a bunch of academics or ecofreaks in the capital who are trying to, basically, impose our view of the world on rural Newfoundland. There is that danger, but we have identified that very early within our planning strategy and we are going to try to decentralize the group, as you say, and develop smaller chapters to disseminate it throughout the province into the rural areas.

We have a long way to go because it is probably no accident that, in the ten years since we have had this legislation that, basically, could protect ecological reserves and natural areas, there has been relatively little success in that a lot of the rural public in Newfoundland view natural-areas protection with a great degree of skepticism in that they see it as a land grab and a threat to their historical rights to use the land as they have done for centuries. We also have to overcome that bias and that perception and bring forth the notion that you can still have land protection and natural-areas protection without a completely hands-off kind of strategy. There are compatible activities within that and there are all kinds of shades of grey in that, of course, going right up to, perhaps, ecological reserves, where you would want to restrict a number of activities. But we have to also overcome that sort of cultural perception that we are not out there, basically, to put a fence around somebody's backyard and tell them that they can no longer go in there.

These issues are well ingrained in the Newfoundland public and they have not been enhanced perhaps by the precedents that have been set up in trying to establish the national parks here. There has been quite a bit of animosity that has arisen through the establishment of, certainly, the national park on the west coast of the province. That is exactly what happened, initially, when the federal park was established. They started to institute what was park policy at the time and it meant that the traditional rights of the people in the enclave communities, from their perception, were trampled on. That was not part of the deal as far as they were concerned.

Now, I think Parks has changed quite a bit and that has been relaxed quite a bit; a sort of an adaptive management approach has taken place there and, certainly, that situation has been defused somewhat, and swimming pools help, yes. But, it is that kind of precedent and that kind of legacy that we have to fight against.

Bill Need has been a founding member of this Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council and it is interesting that one of the subject areas that all the speakers have raised is that, when you are getting into something like parks systems planning, you really do need to have an explicit target because perhaps this is another reason why the WER Act process has failed to date, because there has never been a master plan. In each and every group, including big business, wonders what is next on the agenda. If I give you this over here, what do you have in your hip pocket? Do you want 1,500 hectares over here, maybe 150,000 over there?

So, that is the beauty, I guess, of a systems planning approach, i.e. to try to systematize what you are trying to do, what you are trying to establish by land classification, by a diversity, etc. and, basically, try to set your targets and approach it maybe by eliminating some of the ad hocery that we had in the past.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I find your comments very interesting and they tie in a little bit with what Arlin mentioned, if I can sort of paraphrase or quote him directly. We were talking about advocacy groups, etc., yet you stated that parks need to be established with a long-term commitment. What you are talking about, in order to bring the public on side, is that we are not going to put fences around it. But somehow you have to change attitudes and somehow get people to come to terms with the fact that the way we did business before is not the way that we are going to do business in the future. Yes, we are going to take some rights away that you may have had in the past.

Arlin, you also said that protected areas will survive if supported by local residents and that will only come about if they see a benefit. That is one of the biggest things that we find that we need to overcome. Working within park agencies, we are not accountable to the public, we are accountable to the people whom the public have elected and very few of them understand what in the world we are talking about.

When you are talking about a systems planning approach, the locals whom you need to bring onboard are not the people who are going to live beside a park. You are talking about the politicians who have a provincial perspective or a national perspective. You are talking about industry, and here we come along and we are taking things away. That is how we are perceived. The minute we enter the room, we are the people who are going to take things away, lock them up and take them out of production. How do you propose to deal with that?

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): If I may offer just a couple of gratuitous comments on this, there is no solution, per se. Obviously, there are a whole bunch of steps that have to be taken and, as you in your very first comments pointed out, I think there has to be a very clear, firm message that we are changing the way we do business because we have a new understanding of what the purpose of these protected areas is or an enriched one in terms of their ecological values, in particular.

So, I think that message has to be understood, accepted and owned by people, the leaders, and communicated very firmly. I think that also has to be reflected in targets. We will finish a system. It does have these goals. Now, how and where? We are certainly trying to feel our way in this just in mounting the NGO contribution to the national effort. Then I think you have to deal, as you said, really, particularly with two different sets of interests, the industrial and other major, resource stakeholders, which tend to operate at the provincial level or regional level, not locally. That is where their strategic decisions are made. And also then, you have to deal with the local communities, residents, etc.

On the industry side, I am persuaded - and here I benefit from having spent ten or twelve years in the Ontario context - that, across the country now, the nature of the debate between conservationists and industry is changing and I think that is why it makes the timing of our involvement in shaping the definition of sustainable development so critical.

Ten years ago in Ontario, when you went through the exercise of the parks systems planning that Ken summarized and when you sat down at the table with the mining industry or the forest industry, the likely response to any suggestion of new areas was, "No way, you already have too much, not a stick more, not an acre more". Now, I think that you are more likely to get, at least, again, at the sort of association level, a response of, "Well, we agree that this is important to do, but we are very concerned about how much and where". In other words, the nature of the debate has shifted from "if" to "how" and that is very significant. I think that we can work with the "how", but we have difficulty working with the "if".

So, the nature of the debate has changed, I think, with industry and I think, now, as well, we have to do a little experiment. We really now have to roll up our sleeves and not lose sight of our protection objective, but be willing to experiment a bit. For example, it is certainly our aim, in the endangered spaces campaign, to try to find particular situations and particular natural regions where it may be possible for industry and the conservation community, themselves, to agree on a protected-area proposal that meets a representation objective and does not rip off somebody's resource rights.

I think that is possible. I do not think that it is universally possible, but I do think that there are cases where that can happen which can send a very strong signal that the agenda is realistic and that we can, in fact, answer the how much and where question. That can reverberate back to politicians saying, "Yes, let us move forward on the system".

So, in dealing with industry, I think there is a willingness and a readiness, with the right, site-specific circumstances, to actually step forward to the table and negotiate. We, being WWF and other conservation groups, really have to stick our nose into that one.

On the local level, I think that we have to be more sensitive, in particular, not to try to paint the answer that there is going to be jobs, jobs, jobs in protected areas, but to stick to the message that this does require a change in the way of business, but then look for real opportunities to reinforce what, I think, are usually there in terms of hidden interests and commitments to maintaining the landscape. We have to do a better job in articulating the cultural arguments for landscape retention in its present state, particularly, of course, in dealings with aboriginal communities, which now - and increasingly across Canada - will involve a huge part of the land base.

I think there are arguments that are not economic - they may be utilitarian, but, certainly, are not necessarily economic - that can be persuasive to at least a segment of local residents who favour protected areas.

In addition, when you take the natural regions approach and the goal is representation, I think that, in many natural regions, there will not automatically be one and only one site that is going to do the job; there will be a number. That gives you flexibility. The goals stay the same and we will represent the natural region, but, again, within that microcosm, how and where do not only have one answer. That flexibility should be used by both non-government and government agencies to give local people a say in site selection. We can provide information and we can provide resources to people to help them interpret the information and make the selection. Again, we can make some real advances there.

Probably, once more, on a sort of demonstration-project basis, we have to kind of edge our way into this one, but I think that there is real room for greater local involvement in site selection that will get us over some of the traditional, social and local political obstacles. Particularly, in the Ontario context, which is the one that I am most familiar with, a lot of what comes across as resentment against protected areas is much more rooted in a generalized alienation and sense of being disenfranchised in government decision-making. It finds its outlet in anti-parks sentiment, but I think that it is much more deeply rooted and I think, frankly, with some very carefully targeted experiments in local decision-making about protected areas, we can undo that sentiment.

For example, in your own jurisdiction, Jake, the Minister's package, which was just released, identifies a couple of specific sites as ones that the agency, the Ministry, will probably move ahead on it; the Chilcotin comes to mind. When a Minister provides that overture, the conservation community should respond and come to the table and try to work to set up a process for making site selection a locally driven activity, at least, within the parameters of achieving representation.

So, this is a very long-winded response, but it is an absolutely critical issue that you have raised - the $64.00 question in this whole game, if there is one. I think there are answers or there are at least steps towards answers and we have to be very strategic in taking those, probably, in a sort of exemplary fashion, i.e. a couple of carefully selected sites.

CHAIRMAN: I just have a comment on this issue which, I agree, is a key issue. Your last remark, Arlin, points out the conundrum that agencies have. On the one side, you are pushing and others are pushing and we are pushing ourselves for quick action and, yet, the critical factors that control whether you can act quickly are often very slow to overcome, and I am talking about things like local opposition, etc. Those two things are acting at counter purposes and we have a problem to resolve. Claude.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question for Arlin in regard to his famous 12% solution or formula proposed in endangered spaces. That 12% has caused a lot of discussion in our group, the National Parks Systems Planning Branch, for a couple of reasons, the first of which is that we can represent the network of our natural regions framework, for example, with far less than 12%; in fact, I think the calculation that I did is something like 3% to complete the national parks system. I would suspect that other jurisdictions could similarly do likewise. In other words, they could protect adequate representation of each of their regions within their parks systems and other protected areas with far less than 12%.

The other argument is also one of biological diversity. I know that some of the recent studies that I have looked at show, for example, that, with 5% or 6% of the total land area protected under a different, protected-area category, you can represent something like 95% to 97% of the biota of a given jurisdiction. So, how do you reconcile the 12% with the goals that you have set? It causes us problems because the two just do not match. We can do the job with far less and, yet, we get a tremendous number of letters saying, 12%, 12%, 12%.

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): I think you are right in the sense that there is no magic to that number, absolutely. It is not a scientific number in a strict sense and, in fact, it is clearly subordinate, in our view, to the goal of representation.

The number was never intended to apply to an individual jurisdiction, let alone to a natural region. I think, frankly, in some cases, where the ecological diversity of the region is very high, as perhaps in parts of B.C., it may end up requiring more than a 12% number in some unit of area and, in other cases, clearly less. I do not hold to the number as anything other than a rough guideline for the country that is useful for communicating the overall mission and that is necessary to have to answer when people say, "Well, how much is this going to mean?"

Unfortunately, it is kind of like the case of being damned if you do and damned if you do not. If you lay out a goal of ecological representation and you do not state any kind of number, people will say, "Well, what are you talking about? Do you want the whole country or is this really just a case of another couple of parks that are necessary?" So, you have to, in fact, have an answer to the question. In terms of the general discussion, globally and within Canada, I think you piggyback on the numbers that are in the air and those that are coming to us from IUCN, from Bali(ph), from the Brundtland Commission, etc.. So, I think that there is some general acceptance of that order of magnitude as being more or less right.

Finally, when you look at where we are now in Canada in terms of percentage of land protected and the number of ecological regions that are seen to be represented, it is not wildly out. Our calculations in this latest progress report on spaces talk about 3.4% of the country being protected and that means no logging, mining or hydro in reserves. Roughly speaking, that is maybe a little more than a quarter of the way towards the 12% guideline. When you look at the number of ecological regions that refers to, it is, again roughly, in a sort of a quarter to a third in terms of the likely number we are going to end up with when the map is finally drawn.

So, I think we are probably going to end up, ten years from now, if we finish the job of representation, being in that range. So, frankly, it does not disturb me a lot to keep using the number because of the reasons that I mentioned, i.e. it is hard to not have one. I always emphasize, as do we, as an organization, that it is a guideline for achieving an ecological goal, not "the" goal.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, it is more of a comment than a question, Arlin, about the topic that you were discussing before about the local public, etc. When we were doing the Baie du Nord region and held a lot of public hearings, the people of Newfoundland were not so much against the idea of protecting and preserving areas, I think the concept was there and they wanted the protection, but just not in their backyards. So, it was not so much that they were totally against it, but exactly where do we put it.

Correct me if I am wrong, but the case in Gros Morne is one of temporary compromise and, while we do not lose our long-term goal, for traditional hunting and other traditional things that took place, it was for a generation. And in the long-term, after that generation has passed and once the new generation comes forward with their conservation in mind, we will not have to worry about the tradition again and passing it on for another two or three generations down the road. So, we do get our goal in the long run, but, temporarily, we do have to make some compromises.

CHAIRMAN: On that point, I think it is two or three generations; Neil, do you know? It is more than one, anyway. But you are right; there are compromises like that and it raises the question that was in my mind earlier when Rick was talking about tailoring the policy to the area. In dealing with local people, you should be able to say, "Well, in this area, that particular activity might be permitted, but some others might not", depending on what is in the area.

Of course, the problem for national systems like Canadian Parks' National Parks System is that, if you do not have an overall policy that is fairly clear, you then have difficulties explaining it, enforcing it and managing it. So, there is a bit of a conundrum there about how we do that, but your comment was correct, we are moving inexorably towards a more flexible system which I think is going to be necessary as we move towards completion of the system and work with some of these areas where these issues are coming to the fore.

And people, I think, in general, are less ready to accept the heavy hand of government action and demand that their local views and community views be listened to and the politicians are more sensitive to that, so the climate is changing and we are changing slowly but surely.

Jake, I think you wanted to ask another question.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I just wanted to pursue this situation a little further because I think it is a serious issue that we have to address in parks systems planning, and that relates to a long-term commitment to safeguard areas that we want safeguarded. Also, in the use of the 12%, to be honest with you, the way that I think that the politicians see it - and I am speaking for the West - is, the minute they give in to a number of areas that have been identified and say, "Yes, we will look at those", their position is, as the environmentalists will say, " You are not committed" and they are off getting more. That 12% is looked upon as minimum.

Your comments, also, Arlin, that, in some areas of B.C., maybe it is 14% or 15%, that is automatically thought of. So, what you are now getting are the decision-makers, who have to have the long-term interest and the best interests of the province or the country in mind, feeling very, very uneasy about where it is going and being really pushed. We have to come to terms with that and the people who influence public policy. I am afraid that includes industry. It also includes the academic community. It is more than just grassroots. I, personally, think that there is a total change needed in our way of conventionally thinking about things.

When I look, for instance, at the free miner, for a hundred bucks, being able to stake his claim, exclusive rights for as long as he pays enough to keep that claim alive, in my view, that is kind of antiquated. The same thing applies to the forest industry.

The other thing that I want to come back to is: What are the benefits to industry? Using B.C. as an example, when we say 12%, 26% of B.C. is productive forest area. The minute you say 12%, the forest industry sees its portion of productive forest land reduced a great deal. Your mining industry is identified within the province, certain areas - and most of that stuff is secret as to where mineral potential is - the minute you say 12%, they see that being cut off. We have to address where the benefits are to them.

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): What are the benefits? I am constantly learning how sensitive industry leaders are to public opinion. Whether or not that is immediately reflected in the changing mode of operation on day 2 after they read the polls or not, that is the question, but there is an incredible sensitivity and perception that they operate by virtue of public consent. Ultimately, that is the sensitivity that has to be played on. The benefits are, I think, in many cases, for CEOs, intangibles of security, of a sense of being able to look ahead with some assurance of what the world is going to look like then.

So, I really do not underestimate the power, properly conveyed, of the message that a systematic approach is the best way to provide certainty in the operating environment. I would be the last to argue the case that protected areas have direct, financial payoffs to industry, apart from the tourist industry or industries associated with celebrating the natural values of those sites undisturbed.

I think, for resource industries, the benefits are in security, indirectly, in encouraging them to shift the nature of their operations to be more efficient. And I think you are finding already that the former pollution baddies of the world are saying, "Gee, we are making money from cleaning up. This is not so bad after all." Well, surely, the same will someday be true in Canada's resource industries. We are actually more competitive in the global market because we changed these practices and, whether or not it is ever seen that the cause was a shrinking land base or not, I think that is going to be a factor in the future economic vitality of the industries, the sense of having to learn to live within the biological limits. So, I would never make an argument to the forest industry that they should look upon protected areas as helping them make a buck, although perhaps MacMillan Bloedel believe that they have done that from their redwood reserve, I do not know, or Cathedral Grove, rather.

But I think there are benefits. I think they can be explained convincingly at a provincial level. I think there is a basis for politicians to actually have that discussion with industry and agree that there are some benefits.

In the case of mining, it is a little bit trickier, I think. But, there again, just a couple of weeks ago in Ontario, on the front page of the Globe and Mail, Falconbridge and one of its many subsidiaries or companies that have just merged or unmerged, I cannot remember the whole chain of events, but they, basically, gave back to the province mining rights to a very significant natural area, because it has inspired the Group of Seven, etc., as far as I can tell, as a self-interested but genuine public gesture with no benefit on their back.

In fact, I think it is rather unfortunate that the province, at least in terms of the publicity on it, did not even respond in kind with some celebration saying, "Yes, we will give this area special status or something." The line in the paper was, "Well, somebody else may, once again, have future mining rights, depending on the change of government." That was as much security as the industry received, but, nevertheless, the executives of that company clearly saw, if not the writing on the wall only, they saw some PR benefit for them in making such a gesture, and I. . .

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is just because we have a couple of claims in Strathcona that they own too.

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): I am sure they are expecting the letters to come in saying, "Now, if you have done it here, do it there too".

I guess I am optimistic - and I think you have to be in this business - that the world is changing in that regard. We have to be pushing the frontier, but, very diligently, in specific sites and and not gauging our expectations on only the toughest situations we are facing, but also on the basis of the easy ones.

I think there are some easy situations to move in that should build a sort of climate of success and the sense that the expectations of finishing systems is realistic; so we should always be looking for some opportunities as well as wringing our hands about the frustrating situations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In terms of Ontario's case and the debate, when we actually got into the systems planning with the forest industry, the tourist industry and the mining industry, there was a fair amount of emotion in all of the camps, but, now that the systems plan is, basically, in place, in our case, the forest industry, to a large extent, is not as serious an adversary as we thought they might continue to be. They played the game, to use those words, and they won some and we lost some and we won some and they lost some. But the area now that the forest industry is really getting interested in, and it happens more so now, is in the areas of natural and scientific interest.

They know where the parks system is and they understand it and what the policies are and the government is quite clear on no commercial forest activity in those parks, but the areas of natural and scientific interest are kind of a new animal for them. They are a byproduct of our systems planning process where we joined them to achieve protection and we do make some provision there for some resource activities with protection in the core areas.

The tourist industry is kind of an interesting one in the systems planning process. When it began and the debate was on, there was no way that we wanted to have these parksand no way that we wanted to be in those parks, and they were all fairly emotionally based arguments that this was all bad.

Now that things are settling out and the parks are established and other areas are being accessed on Crown land, being in the parks system as a tourist operator is not necessarily all bad. They are getting a protected environment to work within and it is an area where we still have trouble, though, sort of conceptualizing it and understanding it well because there is a fair amount of resistance, from our point of view in the parks system, by some publics to expand that tourist industry and we just have not ourselves gotten quite the right mix.

I can remember, in the systems planning process, when it was done in that comprehensive context, the conclusion about forests overall was that we were all forced to go through the objectives and targets and setting out numerical targets, how much we needed. Forests were asked to do that as well and the conclusion, after it was all over, was that the forest industry is tight but manageable. We should be able to meet the targets at both parks as well as the targets related to forests.

In the mining community, Norm probably can speak to this more effectively than I can, but there was heated debate with respect to the prospect of the parks and so on and what the implications are. Even now, we really have not heard an awful lot in the last little while from the mining community. I do not know why that is, but we just have not heard an awful lot.

The nature of the debate now on parks is changing from those sort of broad resource industries and their stakes in the world to the debate over the traditional activities which people have enjoyed on Crown land. That great mass of Crown land now has some restrictions on it, things related to vehicles, hunting, allterrain vehicles, access to fishing. These are the things that we are getting a lot of heat about now, particularly in our waterway parks, some of which are fairly long.

The Missanabie River, for example, which is a CHRS, is going through the management planning process and there is tremendous local interest in some of these small communities there. It is a real event when public consultations comes to town. The little town of Metis is very small and we are the event when we get out there in our management planning. But those are the issues that they are interested in. Are we going to be able to continue to do all of those things that we have always done? I do not think the commercial resource activities are as serious in the area of debate as those are.

MR. R. McCUBBIN (Newfoundland and Labrador): One of the ways that the Protected Areas Association is trying to tackle this problem is that we will be letting a contract in the next short while with Chris Vaughan, who is an economist with Munn School of Business, to do sort of an economic impact study looking at what economic spinoffs have accrued to local communities that are adjacent to protected areas, be they provincial or federal parks, and we think that the results of those studies are going to help the advocacy with public.

For one reason, in a lot of places in rural Newfoundland, with the failure of the fishery, basically, their only resource base is gone and they are facing total economic depletion and there is no basis for those communities to stay there any longer. But if you look at some of these communities that are in that kind of situation that are close to some of the wilderness areas, like the

Avalon Wilderness Area or some of the seabird sanctuaries, there has been a proliferation of small cottage industries that take people out for tours of whale-watching or seabirds or bring people in to see the Woodland Caribou herd on the Southern Avalon. They are making a surely good dollar at it. And I think people in these areas are starting to sit up and say, "Hey, there are opportunities here that we never even dreamed of and maybe this is not a bad thing." This is why we would like Chris to look at the situation. We think that a study is going to show to the Newfoundland public that it is not all doom and gloom if you do decide to protect an area.

The other perspective that I think you have to bring to this is that, when you are sitting down with either industry or a local community to talk about parks planning or natural areas protection, there are two things that have to be inherent in that process; one is honesty and the other is flexibility. Bill certainly is in a better position to speak about this, but, if you look at the Baie du Nord Wilderness Area, that was the last, large, wilderness area to be established in this province.

That was a long and tortuous path to get that wilderness area protected. If you look at what was originally proposed versus what was eventually approved, they are completely different animals. What was eventually approved was, basically, an adaptation of both government and WERAC, in association with industry and the public trying to say, "Okay, basically, this is what we are trying to do in terms of achieving the natural systems protection. This is what your concern is in terms of wanting to cut wood in a local area or wanting to do some hunting in the area. This is what the logging people's bottom line." Eventually, they formulated an agreement that became a wilderness area out of that whole thing.

So, no matter whether it is being done by an NGO or government, you have to be prepared to be extremely flexible in this to the point where, if you can protect a given area, whether it is an arboreal forest or whatever representative, heathland, ecosystem type, you have to be intelligent about it and not try to select that area in a given ecoregion if you know from day one that it is going to cause all kinds of grief and hardship because it is a self-defeating kind of argument if you have no chance of success to begin with. There has to be a certain amount of rationalization of where you want these areas if there is some flexibility in assigning protected-area status within your land base, to start with, before you start these negotiations.

MR. W. NEED (Newfoundland and Labrador): There are two points that I want to make. The 12%, last year, when the Baie du Nord was passed finally, this is a 3,500 square kilometer area with exploration, but no mining at all and no cutting. When Canada passed that, I am sure of the fact that we had numbers that said that we have 1.2% of the area protected and Arlin's group was saying that you need 12%. That had to be in the minds of the politicians. I am not saying it was the only argument, but it helped. So, do not take the number too seriously, but it does have a purpose, believe me.

The second point that I want to make, with respect to justifying your position with respect to the mining industry and the forest industry, in the time that I have worked professionally in this province, I have seen maybe $15 or $20 million spent on forest inventories, mining inventories, you name it, all kinds of resource inventories and development-oriented inventories. There has never been an inventory of what our natural features are.

As Rick said, this contract report that World Wildlife Fund supported is the first time that we have done that with the exception of two national parks which have very good resource inventories. So, I do not feel a real strong need to justify these things to the industrial people. I think they are in a very good position to protect their own rights. I do not feel that as a first priority need.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. I think we should wrap up. Arlin had the first word, so I will not give him the last. We are running overtime. I am not sure I should attempt to sum up what I have heard. Maybe I could sum up what I have not heard. I have not heard anyone say that systems planning is a bad idea. I have not heard anyone say that, if we do it, we should not base it on science and on knowledge.

I have heard some encouraging words about how things like targets help with industrial opposition and some good discussion about how we should deal with things like local opposition which, I think, in the end, are our real difficulty in expanding park systems.

So, I will leave it at that. I am sure you would all want to join with me in thanking our panelists, Rick, Arlin and Ken. It has been a very stimulating discussion. Thank you very, very much.

JULY 19TH, 1990

MORNING SESSION

WORKSHOP "B"

PARKS ROLE AND PARTICIPATION IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

MR. G. PROUSE (Director of Parks, Manitoba): This workshop is Workshop "B", Parks Role and Participation in Sustainable Development.

I would just like to introduce the panel. On my far left is Bill Watkins, a resource planner with the province of Manitoba who has had a significant amount of involvement in the business of sustainable development in Manitoba. His paper will be a broad overview of the concept of sustainable development and, in particular, some of the things that Manitoba has been doing because, as all of you well know, Manitoba is on the cutting edge of sustainable development.

Seated next to Bill is Alan Appleby, whom most of you know, the Assistant Deputy Minister from Saskatchewan. Alan is going to take some of the concepts that Bill is presenting and apply them more specifically to the role of parks.

Seated next to Alan is Dr. Jon Lien, Chairman of the Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland, who is going to be even more specific and go into some detail regarding the concept of the scientific application within parks.

Now, in terms of objectives of the workshop, as most of you know, we have been talking about a Ministers' Meeting sometime in September and one of the papers that the Ministers will be reviewing is the one on Sustainable Development and the Role of Parks. So, as a group of Directors, we have been trying to flesh out some principles and what we would like to get out of this particular workshop is to sort of clarify some of the ideas and examples that would surround those principles and to test whether or not those principles are actually applicable. In my view, that is the primary objective of the workshop.

So, with that, I would like to introduce Bill Watkins and have him present his paper. Bill.

PRESENTATION BY MR. WILLIAM WATKINS

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

MR. W. WATKINS (Province of Manitoba): Good morning. Sustainable development, in the broadest sense of its meaning, is a venerable concept with antecedents which can be traced back to long before the current infatuation with the term.

Alan was quoting Plato yesterday and, not to be outdone, I thought I would remind some of you that there is a quote in Isaiah of the Old Testament. I normally hesitate to ever quote the Bible and I really cannot do it word for word, but there is one verse which actually cautions against the exclusion of wild man and wild things by the over-development of settlements and farmland. I looked for it in the room upstairs where there is usually a Bible in the drawer, but, unfortunately, there is only the New Testament in this hotel. I might also add that it was brought to my attention by someone of a far more religious background than myself.

Linkages between economy and environment have been explored in a series of international endeavours beginning in earnest in 1972 with the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment that was held in Stockholm. In 1980, the publication of the World

Conservation Strategy represented, at its time, a global consensus on conservation and development. It articulated three main goals: The maintenance of essential, ecological processes and life support systems; the preservation of genetic diversity; and the sustainable utilization of species in ecosystems.

And that thought, sustainable utilization of species in ecosystems, as I said, has been around for an awfully long time. The World Commission on Environment and Development or the Brundtland Commission, as it has come to be known, elaborated on that third point, the sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems, and popularized the concept of sustainable development, as they called it, with the publication of its report in 1987.

So, what is sustainable development? In its simplest terms, it means managing the use of living resources so that they remain productive forever. To quote from the Brundtland Commission - and you have all heard this quote before - "it means meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Beyond this, no globally accepted definition of the concept exists. However, most definitions that are used do adhere to certain core beliefs.

The Brundtland Commission emphasized key properties of sustainable development and I will just quote a few of them that come directly from the report, "Our Common Future".

> "Sustainable development requires the conservation of plant and animal species. Sustainable development requires that adverse impacts on the quality of air, water and other natural elements are minimized so as to sustain the overall integrity of ecosystems. Sustainable development must not endanger the natural systems that support life and earth."

Then, on the human side of the equation, "Our Common Future" says:

> "Sustainable development requires meeting the basic needs of all persons and extending to all the opportunity to satisfy their aspirations for a better life. It requires the promotion of values that encourage consumption standards that are within the bounds of the ecologically possible and to which all can reasonably aspire. It may require economic growth where basic needs are not being met. Elsewhere, it can be consistent with economic growth, provided the content of growth reflects the broad principles of sustainability. Finally, it requires shared responsibility, among all stakeholders, for developing comprehensive and equitable solutions to environmental and economic problems."

Now, I would like to quote from another definition provided by Dr. William Reese from the University of British Columbia, just to compare and contrast the two. He says:

> "Sustainable development is positive, socio-economic change that does not undermine the ecological and social systems upon which communities and society are dependent. Its successful implementation requires integrated policy, planning and social learning processes. Its political viability depends on the full support of the people it affects through their governments, their social institutions and their private activities."

He also went on to express himself in terms of the properties of sustainable development and his properties are a little bit different than the Brundtland Commission's.

> "Sustainable development is oriented to achieving explicit ecological, social and economic objectives. It may impose ecological limits on material consumption while fostering qualitative development at the community and individual levels. It requires government intervention, but also the leadership and cooperation of the private sector. It demands policy integration and coordination at all spatial scales and among relevant, political jurisdictions and it depends on educational planning and political processes that are informed, open and fair."

Now, you can see the core concepts that run through both, but he does differ a little bit in terms of, basically, demanding that governments intervene and regulate.

Canada's National Task Force on Environment and Economy recommended the creation of regional roundtables in recognition of the shared responsibility aspect of sustainable development. The roundtables are intended to bring together senior decision-makers and representatives of the many diverse sectors of Canadian society including, but not restricted to, environmental organizations, labour, business and aboriginal peoples. The roundtables provide a forum for reaching consensus on how to move society towards a sustainable future.

Now, the lack of a precise definition in the Brundtland Report and, I suppose, the lack of any definition that has been globally accepted provides an opportunity for each roundtable in each jurisdiction to cut its teeth in the crafting of a formal definition of sustainable development that is unique in its regional perspective and reflects the salient characteristics of each jurisdiction's economy and environment. I think that is a real strength.

One would hope that it would be easier to build commitment by both citizens and government to a set of principles arrived at through this process of consultation and consensus. It is possible then to have a family of definitions of sustainable development nationwide that are similar in scope and objective, but differ in detail.

Now, I would like to use Manitoba as an example for a while of one such definition that has been arrived at by a roundtable. I will ask someone to hand out copies of the principles and guidelines that have been arrived at.

Manitoba's roundtable was established in October of 1988 and it is the only roundtable in Canada to be chaired by a premier of the province. Six cabinet ministers are members of the roundtable in addition to the premier. The stated objectives of the roundtable include: Overseeing development and implementation of a sustainable development strategy for Manitoba; reviewing the implementation of sustainable development within the public sector; and encouraging the adoption of codes of environmental practice by individual businesses, farmers and resource users. In February of this year, the roundtable approved a definition of sustainable development in the form of ten fundamental principles and six guidelines, which you now hold in your hands. I would like to just briefly highlight some aspects of it.

The first principle is the integration of environmental and economic decisions. It, of course, reflects the heart of the Brundtland Commission Report and the World Conservation Strategy and provides for the linkage of environmental and economic issues and policies.

The second principle, stewardship, borrows directly from the language of the Brundtland Commission and requires that we manage not only for today's needs, but for the needs of future generations as well.

The third principle formalizes the concept of shared responsibility that led to the creation of the roundtables in the first place.

The fourth principle requires that we anticipate and prevent significant, adverse, environmental and economic impacts of policy, programs and decisions or to take mitigative measures when adverse impacts are unavoidable.

The fifth principle, conservation, accepts, in their entirety, the three goals of the World Conservation Strategy.

The sixth principle is a reflection of the Manitoba government's recycling initiative which actually began before these principles were endorsed by the roundtable.

The seventh and eighth principles are a bit different from the preceding ones in that they do not accept the status quo. Words like "preservation" and "maintenance" have been replaced by words like "enhance, restore, rehabilitate and reclaim". And I think, as such, they reflect an honest desire to pass on an improved environment to future generations.

The ninth principle relates to technological innovation that will probably be required to achieve sustainable development.

The tenth and last principle repeats the old adage, "Think globally and act locally".

Now, I will not go over the fundamental guidelines, you can read them for yourselves, but they are intended to have equal status to the principles supporting them and indicating how Manitoba will achieve its vision of a sustainable future. They elaborate many of the properties of sustainable development that we have already talked about. You will also notice that there is a heavy emphasis on public participation.

It is against the backdrop of these principles and fundamental guidelines that Manitoba's programs, policies and developments must now be evaluated for sustainability.

Now, I would like to return for a moment to the objectives of Manitoba's roundtable, two in particular, overseeing developments and implementation of a sustainable development strategy for the province; and reviewing the implementation of sustainable development within the public sector. I think these two objectives make it essential that parks be integrated into the roundtable process and resulting sustainable development strategies. The traditional mandate of parks - conservation, preservation, tourism, outdoor recreation and, more recently, environmental and cultural education - have an important role to play in sustainable development.

Yet, to continue with the Manitoba example, the endorsed guidelines and principles do not speak directly to all elements of that mandate. The concept of protected lands, for example, is inherent in some of the principles, such as stewardship and conservation, but it is not mentioned directly, although both the Brundtland Commission and the World Conservation Strategy recognized that the setting aside of protected lands was an essential component of sustainable development.

Parks management philosophy has long accepted environmental protection and sustainable, recreational development as basic policy goals. But it should mean something more in parks than just the basic compromise between development and environment that the Brundtland Commission espouses for all developments on all lands. It means creating a diversity of outdoor recreation experiences and then managing those experiences within defined limits to protect the integrity of the resource base and to sustain diversity in park experiences. It means giving equal weight in the system to cultural, social and economic values when we are planning our parks. And it means that preservation is a legitimate option, initially equal to other options when resource allocation decisions are being made rather than being reserved for areas where resource harvest options are minimal or exhausted.

I think it is important for parks agencies to articulate the contribution that parklands can make in achieving the goals of sustainable development. It is also important to demonstrate the value of parks in helping governments live up to the principles, such as stewardship, conservation, rehabilitation and reclamation, recently endorsed by the Manitoba government and the roundtable.

And we must involve the public. Building trust with our constituency groups takes time and cannot be rushed. Honesty, openness and frankness will serve us well.

Before I finish and turn over to Alan, I would also like to just mention a few of the traps and pitfalls that we can get ourselves into in discussing sustainable development. First of all, it is not universally accepted as the means to our planet's salvation. There is a fair degree of cynicism and mistrust amongst some of the environmental groups and I think Colin Isaacs, the former Director of the Pollution Pro-vote of Toronto, summed it up when he said, "Once again, business has won. They got the action word, "development"; all we got was the adjective."

Secondly, sustainable development is not a new name for carrying on in the same old way. There is a perception that, as sustainable development is gradually embraced by the political mainstream of the country, its meaning is drifting away from the idea of a sustainable environment and towards the concept of sustainable growth. The Brundtland Commission made it clear that major social and economic change is needed and is needed now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Bill. We are going to have the three presentations first and then we will entertain questions and observations. Alan.

PRESENTATION BY ALAN APPLEBY

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

MR. A. APPLEBY (Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, Saskatchewan): Thank you very much, Gordon. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

It is my pleasure to be here today to present some thoughts and ideas on sustainable development, specifically, some things that, I think, might pertain to parks role in participation in sustainable development.

Bill has given us a really good overview of sustainable development's several definitions. What we need to do as park agencies is to take a look at how we can make it real, define it so that we can understand it and make commitments to the concept that it embodies, and do that in our own ways through the various systems and processes that we have.

Just by way of background, from my perspective, Saskatchewan, like other provinces and territories, has a roundtable on the environment and the economy. It has been in business for a little over a year, has 18 members, including 3 cabinet ministers, one of whom is the Minister responsible for Parks. That Minister also chairs the Conservation Strategy Sub-Committee, which is the group within the roundtable responsible for writing the Conservation

Strategy. So, from that point of view, in Saskatchewan at least, the parks portfolio is well positioned to be represented in a provincial conservation strategy.

The other thing that we have done is to create a small sustainable development unit within our Department. In fact, half of that unit is here this morning. Linda Langford is sitting in the room and she is the manager of our sustainable development process. I have to thank her for a lot of the material that I have with me today.

Our province is currently in the process of completing a conservation strategy and, obviously, that is intended to provide a blueprint for action, we hope, to achieve a sustainable development mode within our province and to link into the activities being done in other places. This effort has resulted in a lot of thinking and talking, first of all, about what sustainable development really is and, secondly, about what it means to us in the parks business and how it can really be achieved.

The concept of sustainable development, as Bill said, is not a new one. I had a quote from the Greek philosopher, Plato, in the fourth century, who said the following:

> "Our land, compared with what it was, is like the skeleton of a body wasted by disease; the soft parts have vanished and all that remains is the bare carcass."

And that is a lament that probably a lot of people in the environmental business are voicing today, especially in places like Brazil, Central America and other parts of the world. In fact, it is happening in a lot of places in Canada.

So, sustainable development is a long-lasting idea, maybe not one that has been very successfully applied by human culture, but, like all ideas, it keeps recurring and it seems now that we may have an opportunity to do something meaningful with it. Whether or not there is really a broad coalition of interests, at least the people on the development side have a piece of the equation and a piece of the discussion in the same room with people on the environment side and, hopefully, working towards the same end.

So, what does this mean to parks? What is our role in sustainable development? To generate some ideas and discussion for this workshop, I thought that I would use some information that came to me not only through our own research within the Department and some of the things that have been going on within the Federal Provincial-Parks Council, where we have been looking at some sustainable development principles, but also some feedback that we got through the public-consultation session of the Green Plan that was held in Regina.

Most of you are familiar and are probably involved, in one way or another, with the Federal Green Plan's background papers and discussions. The Green Plan, as I understnd it, is intended to be a broad format for achieving sustainable development. There was a two-day workshop that involved a broad cross-section of folks in Regina, now looking specifically at parks and protected areas. I thought that some of their ideas were worthwhile to incorporate in what we are talking about today. It gave me a little more of an outside perspective.

What I would like to do is just outline four main roles that, I think, parks could play in forwarding the concept and embodying the concept of sustainable development in our society. Then, we could talk about some of the more specific activities within each of those roles that parks might have an opportunity to participate in.

The first one is that I believe parks can demonstrate an integrated approach to regional, resource management in the establishment of parks and protected areas of natural and cultural significance. In other words, we have an opportunity to show people how integrated management works and we have an opportunity to expand that into a broader regional context.

The second role for parks is that we could develop and present, to specific sectors and society in general, the economic, social, cultural and natural benefits of parks and protected areas. In other words, we have a lot of information and can develop a lot of information on the role that parks play in the economic life and the social life of our country, and parks should be making that case and making sure people know it and understand it.

Thirdly, parks are in an excellent position to improve upon the quality and quantity of the science base, the scientific information and database, that we have for detecting and delineating and managing, generally, environmental issues, but, specifically, parks and park resources.

Fourthly, we have an excellent opportunity in the parks business to encourage the development of educational programs in sustainable development and to do that in a very broad sense among the various jurisdictions.

So, those are the four broad roles and I would like to, under each of those, just take a quick look at some of the specific activities that we might consider undertaking.

The first role was that we might demonstrate an integrated approach to regional, resource management. I see us very much in the public eye with parks systems. We are there as what might be called living museums and laboratories, places where we cannot only preserve our natural and cultural heritage, but also places where we can demonstrate the application of top quality management and places where we can actually prove that sustainable development is a real concept.

So, here are some of the specific activities we might consider. First of all, we could consider working towards a target figure; 12% is one that has been put on the agenda. It is one that the Brundtland Commission has proposed and it is one that has been picked up with respect to things like the Endangered Spaces Campaign that the World Wildlife Fund is currently promoting. Whatever the number and even whether we all agree that 12% or some other number is reasonable, it seems likely that we can have some success if we try to set some target figures of that type and 12% is one that is internationally, as well as nationally, recognized.

Secondly, we should consider existing, protected natural and cultural areas and endangered spaces in the broadest possible sense in meeting whatever goal we set, 12% or otherwise. In other words, we should utilize all manner and form of protected area designations to meet that goal. Parks should not be alone and should not carry the burden by themselves. There is a family of designated areas that contribute in their own way, but, nonetheless, we will always be looked to as leaders and we will always be looked to as one of the more discreet systems that provide for protection. So, we are going to have to work with those other agencies and those other people who are in a position to designate other lands and protect them.

Thirdly, we should be completing our parks systems and, in doing that, we should perhaps be looking more at completing systems within the context of representing the natural regions of our provinces and territories in our country and less at worrying about the time frame in which we do it and setting time deadlines for ourselves. We need plans and processes and I think we do need targets, but I wonder if time deadlines are the best kinds of targets for us to set.

The fourth activity that I would suggest is that we should be actively developing partnerships, not only amongst ourselves [illegible] federal-provincial-territorial parks agencies, because we do that through the Federal-Provincial Parks Council, but with the private sector, with aboriginal groups and with non-government organizations. We need to support all forms of land assembly, resource management and other forms of activities that can lead us to the same goal.

Fifth, in terms of activities, I think that parks could develop an accessible, national information system and database on environmental and cultural features found within parks and provide continued support for the maintenance of such databases.

To look quickly at the second role, which was to develop and present the economic, social, cultural and natural benefits of parks and protected areas, what are some specific actions we might take?

First of all - and I think many of us have worked in this regard - we can improve the documentation and support for protected lands in terms of the economic and social values to encourage wise use of those lands and, in fact, designation of those lands.

Secondly, we can develop a strong rationale for protection from both regional and national economic perspectives. If we are talking about a conservation strategy that is based on environment and economy, then I think we need to be sure that we are integrated into the economy rather than being seen as something that lies outside of the economy. In many cases, of course, we in the parks business have found ourselves across the table from folks who claimed that we were getting in the way of economic progress when, in fact, what we were trying to do was create our own form of economic progress in a different way. But, of course, we were not armed with the same facts and figures as they were.

One of the examples that I used yesterday was that, a couple of years ago, I had a running battle with the Saskatchewan Mining Association. Most of you know tht the Mining Association was present at our conference in Regina last year and, while they may have represented a very different point of view from what some of us had, nevertheless, we do not have a running battle with them anymore. We were successful, as I noted in my State of the Nation Address yesterday, in putting through a no-mining policy for Saskatchewan Parks last year with one minor exception.

This is a big difference from approximately three years ago when we first started to work actively with the Mining Association.

That was the time when we had just created the Clearwater River Wilderness Park, albeit with a wide level of public consultation, and the Mining Association got very alarmed at this huge area of land being incorporated into a wilderness park that they would not have any access to and they arranged a meeting with the Cabinet. When they went to the Cabinet table, they put a gold ingot in the middle of the table worth a quarter of a million dollars. Of course, the Cabinet's eyes were all transfixed by this glowing, gold object and they said, "Now, gentlemen, here is what we are talking about, economic progress and wealth."

Of course, it is much more difficult for us in the parks business to walk in and put anything in the middle of the table that will attract that kind of attention. So, in our own way, we have to be willing to make those arguments because we do have strong arguments. We are an important part of the economy, whether we are in the tourism and recreation business or even whether we are in the natural protection business.

The third action that we can take in terms of developing and presenting economic and other benefits of parks is to take a look at developing the opportunity costs and benefits for protected lands. We do have tourism components, we do have education components, we do have scientific components and I think that we need to take a look at developing and marketing those a little more than we have done.

Under the third role that I had proposed, i.e. to improve upon the quality and quantity of the science base and the database, I think there are several actions that we can take. We should be emphasizing that steps for protection must not and cannot wait for the development of complete data sets. We, very often, have hesitated until we had collected every last jot and tiddle of information available on an area. In many cases, I think we would have been smarter to take the approach that we have enough information to make a case and we should move forward and we should make a case as we move forward for needing and gathering more information.

In that respect, we can emphasize two aspects. One is that we should have sufficient data to allow delineation and rationalization of those areas in the short term, but the second aspect, which is probably more important, is that we should make sure that we do not neglect long-term research on protected-land components, not only to ensure the continuation of those designations, but also to ensure that we will be able to designate other areas.

The third action we can take is to attempt to improve the coordination of databases among various agencies. That will cut down on duplication of costs and effort. It will provide us all with better information, but it will also provide us with a much broader constituency. If other people are able to use our data and if we are able to use theirs, then, automatically, we are meeting multiple needs and we are providing multiple strengths.

Finally, with respect to the database, I think we need to use our protected lands much more than we do to stimulate scientific research, to host scientific research and to be the subject of scientific research. In many cases, as protected areas, we are the background, we are the control and, in some cases, we are the disturbed site or we may have some spectrum. We could certainly benefit from using our protected lands in a wise way to stimulate scientific research in a broader fashion.

The last objective or role that I had set for parks in demonstrating sustainable development was to encourage the development of educational programs in sustainable development among jurisdictions. There are several actions that I think we can take.

Parks can and should take a lead role in demonstrating concepts of sustainable development. We can do that, not only through our educational programs, but we can do that through our maintenance programs, we can do that through our planning programs, we can do that through just about everything we do in the parks business and we should be doing it. There are many practical examples of how we do not, right now, demonstrate sustainable development. Probably most of our brochures, for instance, are not printed on recyclable paper and probably most of our garbage is simply taken to some convenient form of landfill and dumped, etc.

The second activity that we could undertake is to utilize our current information products and our park programs to better coordinate information on protected lands and on concepts of sustainable development. We have publications which range from specific park brochures and nature trail guides all the way up to system-wide booklets and scientific reports. All of those publications, with the addition of a little bit of the right kind of philosophy or a paragraph or a page or an insert, could be taking the message of sustainable developments and the role of parks in sustainable developments to a very broad public.

Thirdly, I think that we could refocus a lot of our current environmental programs in parks to emphasize sustainablity. We have an opportunity to take the kinds of visitor programs that we put on for folks, whether it be a guided nature walk or a craft program for children or an aquatic program that may be focusing on water safety, we have an opportunity to put a sustainable development message into all of those programs if we are willing to do it.

There is no longer any question in my mind, at least, and I do not think in the minds of most park agencies, as to whether parks should be promoting sustainable development. Rather I think it is understood that sustainable development is a management objective for parks and protected areas. It should also be taken for granted that parks assume the goals of the World Conservation Strategy, as they were outlined by Bill, and that it is not a question of what type of role parks play, but rather what are the most immediate actions we can undertake to work towards sustainable development.

So, I think the message is fairly clear, from my point of view, at least, as to the four kinds of things that we can do very broadly. We can work cooperatively and integrate our efforts to achieve sustainable development to demonstrate it in a meaningful way. We can learn to talk the language of the people who might oppose the concept in terms of economic values and other social values of parks and protected areas. We can establish a concrete body of information and data on which to base recommendations and management decisions. We can educate park users and the public in general because it is only through awareness that concern for parks and protected areas can be promoted.

Many of these messages are reflected in our current programs and operations, but I think we can be much more proactive in our approach. Parks are already in the sustainable development business and perhaps it is just a matter of degree that we are attempting to define here.

I would like to see this workshop come forward with some ideas that could be taken back to the Council and I would like to see the Council take those ideas forward to the Ministers and I think that would help us to promote the ideas we are talking about here today.

The future is very much in our hands from our own perspective. To go back to the quote from Plato, he was a man who left a legacy, obviously, if we are still quoting him, and, while they may not be quoting us directly in 2000 years, I think that there is something that we can do here to ensure that our legacy endures through the parks and protected areas that we are responsible for. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alan. Jon.

PRESENTATION BY DR. JON LIEN

PROTECTED AREAS ASSOCIATION, NEWFOUNDLAND

DR. J. LIEN (Protected Areas Association, Newfoundland and Labrador): I would like to tell you first how happy I am to be here today. When Don Hustins asked me to speak to you, I wrote down in my book that I was supposed to speak yesterday afternoon. I did not know that we did this twice, so I had, in fact, something scheduled for this morning.

I work with sea mammals and, over the course of the summer, people from around the province find stranded animals washed up on shore that are very dead and very rotten. We throw them in our freezer and then, when the freezers fill up, we take them out and we have a group dissection. So, this morning, if I was not speaking to you, I would be facing 15 rotting carcasses to do autopsies on. So, when I tell you that I am genuinely happy to be here today, I am telling the truth. My graduate students think I arranged this, but it was one of these happy accidents.

I am listed as representing the Protected Areas Association and I am the Chairman of that group, but I am not going to speak as the Chairman. In one of your other sessions, Rick McCubbin, who is one of the Directors of the Association that is representing us, will tell you about our program.

Rather I am going to talk to you really as a working scientist and tell you some of my views about parks and protected areas. I am not a parks professional, I think I am unique in the room. Again, I am a parks groupie. I came to Canada 25 years ago. I spent my first day in Canada in a park. I spent my first month in Canada camping in a park. Since my arrival here, my wife says that I have spent at least a thousand days in parks and I think that is probably true. I do not have any professional interest in parks, per se, but I have seen parks in terms of their potential, environmentally and culturally and socially, and, over the past, probably, ten years, I have seen them increasingly as a scientific asset. And it is primarily that side of parks that I want to talk about today.

The idea of setting aside areas and protecting them from human development is, in fact, a relatively new one. Yellowstone Park, the first North American park, was created less then 150 years ago. We recently celebrated the hundred years after Banff here in Canada. When those areas of land were set aside, the rationale was certainly not one that they would somehow contribute to sustainable development. That was not an argument that was voiced for setting aside those tracts of land. Through the relatively brief history of protected-area activity in North America, parks and protected areas have been established for many reasons and I think that you, as professionals, are aware of all of these reasons because you deal with constituents who, in fact, emphasize different ones of them.

The idea of establishing and maintaining parks, based on their contribution to sustainable development, is, in fact, a relatively new idea. That view has emerged because of unprecedented changes which have occurred with human populations.

In recent history, the econiche of humans on this planet has expanded greatly. The total human population has doubled over the last generation. Even China, that has the one baby rule, has in the past decade gone from a billion to a billion point one people. The numbers have quickly exceeded five billion. There is virtually no resource on the planet that is not grist for one human mill or another. The pace of human population growth, the awesome exploitation of every available resource continues unabated in spite of the good intentions that are voiced, in spite of some encouraging action by international bodies and national governments. In fact, the growth rates and the exploitation continues unabated.

Human beings in their quest for economic development and improvement in the quality of their lives must come to terms with the reality of resource limitations and the caring capacity of ecosystems. There is an emerging view, not totally accepted, that ecosystems must be managed and resources preserved for future generations. There is certainly a lot of talk about that, but the practices, in fact, are relatively weak.

The central message of the modern conservation movement is that we must preserve these resources and set them aside, and this is the major motivation behind protection of natural areas. I think one of the things that has emerged, in my mind, as human population growth has made this unprecedented assault on the planet and its resources is that the values and the goals for setting aside land have been clarified. It is, indeed, very tough times and, in tough times, it is a good opportunity to set priorities. For me, the priorities in setting aside protected areas are clearly that of conservation and keeping them in perpetuity.

While many people conclude that setting aside protected natural areas somehow achieves conservation in nature and keeps it there for continued use and enjoyment of humans, exactly how setting aside areas contributes to conservation is often unclear to people. It is important that the general public understand how protected areas contribute to conservation and it is very important that park administrators are very clear about how their protected areas contribute to conservation because understanding that has serious implications for the manner in which parks are, in fact, managed.

Parks and protected areas are a possible means of partially achieving three specific objectives that are voiced in the World Conservation Strategy. These are as follows: First, to preserve genetic diversity; secondly, to protect and maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems; and third, that we have sustained utilization of any species or ecosystem. I will talk about each of these in turn.

The history of life on this planet is, in fact, a long series of episodes where populations emerge, flourish and then die. In the evolutionary record, there are all kinds of extinctions. Extinction is a natural process in biological populations and it is a driving force in evolution. The concerns that are voiced about extinctions by scientists today are not about extinction, per se, but they have to do with the causes and the rate at which extinctions occur. In the geological record, there are very, very few cases where there are periods of catastrophic extinctions. There are some. These have occurred because of climate change or something like that. These are periods where, in fact, large numbers of species become extinct.

We are currently in a period of catastrophic extinctions unequaled in the geological record. Extinctions in populations are now occurring at a rate and in numbers that have never before been experienced or been detected. Depending on which scientist you care to listen to, the rate at which these extinctions occur do vary, but, during the period of this seminar, probably three to five species have disappeared forever. The rate is about 3 to 5 per hour. By the end of this decade, a half a million species that now exist on this planet will have disappeared.

Even more alarming than the rate and the sheer numbers of extinctions is our ignorance about the phenomenon. Last January, in Boston, the American Society of Zoologists held their centenary meetings and E. O. Wilson, who is a very eminent socio-biologist and has written a lot on genetic diversity, delivered a plenary talk and the title of his talk was about a study he had conducted on ants. These were ants in a single tree in the tropical rain forest and, in this one single tree, he found 223 different species of ants. That is interesting, but what is astounding and frightening is that only half of those species had ever before been taxonomically described.

Most of us are familiar with lists, like a seawick(ph) or something of endangered animals, and we can all say that we know of some extinct animals or some that are endangered, but more frightening to a scientist are the millions of populations of plants and animals that are destined to disappear without even being recognized taxonomically.

I talked to a soil ecologist - I did not even know there really was such a thing till recently - and she was describing the kinds of work she does. Her standard sample is one cubic metre of soil. She reckoned that, in her average study, 70% of the species she encountered had never been taxonomically described. There are at present, according to E. O. Wilson's estimation, about 3 million species that are known to scientists, i.e. 3 million out of an estimated 30 million and some would say, perhaps, that there are as many as a hundred million. Science is a very new exercise. We are massively ignorant and, when species that we do not know disappear, we cannot understand the consequences of that disappearance or the impact on the ecological processes in which they participate.

You all know the Joanie Mitchell song in which there is a line that says, "You don't know what you got till it is gone." In fact, most of the species that are now disappearing in this catastrophic extinction period are ones we will never know at all.

Parks and protected areas provide some respite from the press of human development. You know the expression, "Parks is arks". Parks, when wisely established and managed, can protect habitat which provide the opportunity for at least portions of populations to continue to survive. The expression, "Park your genes", is a popular expression which refers to the role of parks in protecting genetic diversity.

The World Conservation Strategy says that preservation of genetic diversity is both the matter of insurance and investment. We need this genetic diversity to sustain and improve agriculture, medicine, forestry and so on. We need this genetic diversity to keep the planet's options open and even our industrial options open. We need these many species as a buffer against harmful environmental change. And we always tell people - and I am not sure that this is the best argument for it - these genes provide the raw material for much scientific and industrial innovation.

The second way in which parks and protected areas can contribute to sustained development is by maintaining the essential ecological processes and life support systems. These can be classified in different ways, but, commonly, scientists talk about three main kinds of ecological processes.

The first is species-oriented processes which are things like species competition, natural succession and ecosystem evolution.

The second are transport processes which involve the movement of matter, such as water, minerals and energy, throughout the environment.

The third is environment-oriented processes. This is sort of the physiology of the community. Here are changes in human impact, soil development changes, climate and so on.

Ecosystems are not stable entities that are fixed. They change all the time. They are very complex. As they mature, the rates and the magnitude of processes within systems change. The consequence of any specific activity in the ecosystem, such as burning, grazing, logging, mining, tourist activities and so on, will depend on the state of the ecosystem at that particular time. Any particular activity will have a multitude of effects. Burning, for instance, could change the natural succession, the production and decomposition of organic material, nutrient circulation, water circulation, soil development and so on, and all of these, in turn, would influence the species that depend on these and that, in turn, would, again, circulate back through environmental processes.

Parks, wisely established and managed, can succeed in protecting many such ecological processes, those that we know and those that we have not yet identified. It is the protection of these ecological processes that is the basis for protecting the species that depend on them. You cannot protect genetic diversity without protecting the basic ways in which the environment on which they depend is regulated.

It is a bit more difficult to see how parks and protected areas accomplish the third goal of conservation, ensuring that human utilization of species in ecosystems is sustainable, but I believe that, in fact, they do have a role in this as well. As I mentioned earlier, at present, scientific information about living species on this planet is very incomplete. This necessarily means that our knowledge of species-oriented processes, such as natural succession, species competition and so on, is imperfect and many would say, indeed, very limited.

Knowledge of transfer processes is also very limited and incomplete. We are not surprised when a totally new phenomenon is discovered. When it comes to environment-oriented processes, this community physiology or regulation, in fact, our knowledge is very, very inadequate.

If that is true, how then can we assess the impact of changes associated with human activity? The standard thing that pathologists always tell me is, "We cannot tell you what is wrong with this animal because we do not know how the animal should be when it is working correctly". You have to recognize the normal, before you can recognize the abnormal.

This is true also for the environment. Unless we know, basically, how ecological processes operate, we cannot recognize the impact of human development on them. To recognize changes caused by human development in a particular area, we must recognize at least some of the basic ecological processes and know what their normal variation is. And here is where I feel that parks and protected areas have a key role to play.

In many cases, parks and protected areas provide the only remaining opportunity for scientists to discover these basic, undisturbed, ecological processes, which can provide the baseline on which environmental impact of human development can be evaluated. This requires extensive use of parks and protected areas for scientific study. And here is where I really have an axe to grind.

Not long ago, there was a catalogue of publications that was assembled on science studies that had been done in parks in the eastern part of Canada. It was not a catalogue; it was, in fact, a very short list and many of the things that appeared on the list were not proper science in that they were only presented in the grey literature. They had not completed the scientific process, then through peer review and publication.

We have failed dismally in using parks for their scientific value and this is true both by scientists and park administrators. Scientists have not recognized the value of parks and park administrators have not recognized the responsibility that they have in using protected areas for benchmark indicators of environmental change. There is such a scanty amount of proper scientific work that is done in parks that we cannot honestly face the public and say that we need parks as benchmark indicators for environmental change. We simply have not used what we have to that end.

And worse than that, there seems to be an attitude in many quarters that you could only do science in parks if you cannot do it in any other place. We will never develop the background of information which we need on parks and protected areas, so that they can serve this benchmark role, unless we start concentrating science and ecological sciences in the parks themselves.

Happily, I think the situation is changing. There is a growing recognition, I think, in some quarters in parks and, certainly, in some quarters in science, that we should be using parks as these benchmark, ecological, archive, study sites. And let me just tell you a couple of things that are happening.

One, I point out, is a project of Neil Monroe and there are brochures on the table in the other room. Canadian Parks Service is organizing an international conference on science and parks and protected areas. And I think this conference, which is to be held next spring at Acadia University, will represent a turning point where we begin to understand the potential we have in parks and protected areas for science and we begin to take the responsibility for meeting that potential. If you do not have one of these, I encourage you to pick it up and pass it around to people whom you know.

The second thing that gives me cause to feel encouraged is, again, something that is happening in the Atlantic Region. At Gros Morne National Park, they were going to build a tramway - and this was not decided, it was just being discussed -but now, instead of a tramway in the park, what is being discussed and what is being advanced, in some quarters at least, is a research centre which will have an educational role, residential facilities, staff scientists, visiting scientists and so on. This is a World Heritage Site that was established because of its precious, geological and biological history. Now, for the first time, we are pushing to establish a research centre that will have an ongoing life within the park. My belief is that every park should have that kind of function built into its organization.

I am going to finish my talk by emphasizing one other aspect that I think parks play in sustainable development. This ecological-archive-benchmark-research role is very important, but many of your parks are small. The ecological processes, which are protected, are protected in other places as well, which might make better research reserves. But one of the very important roles that parks have to play is in educating people about the need for conserving and protecting natural areas.

As Chairman of the Protected Areas Association, we are just now conducting studies to see how we can best teach people in Newfoundland to support and advocate protection of natural areas. The easy way or the early indications from these studies, as it turns out, are that you could develop the support for protecting areas if there is a cute creature there or some kind of focal animal that people want to protect, like caribou or moose, or if you can argue for its tourist potential or if you can argue for recreation. It is far more difficult to argue for the establishment of protected areas because of their contribution to sustained development, maintenance of ecological processes, a benchmark, natural areas and so on. It is very difficult because people do not tumble to that kind of argument.

We here desperately need to develop support for protected areas, but I hesitate to take the low road and tell people that, if we have protected areas, we can protect this favorite animal or we can have better recreation or we will bring in tourist dollars. I think we have to bite the bullet and say that we have to educate them to the point that they will understand the role of these protected areas in conservation for them.

The idea of protecting parks for people, rather than against people, I think, is very important and we have an obligation not to take the low road, but to take the high road and conduct education programs so people truly understand the role that parks and protected areas play in the overall conservation strategy for the planet. There is simply no better place to teach people this than in the parks themselves.

First of all, your actions, as park administrators, will speak very loudly. If you are consciously aware in your day-to-day decisions of the conservation implications of your activities and of your programs, that will come through to the people who visit your parks. I think you have an obligation, in your interpretation programs as a prime educational goal, to teach people how your specific provincial park or your specific protected areas contribute to the conservation in this particular local area and on a global scale.

A few years ago, when Gallup or someone did a survey and asked people from whom they received the best environmental information or whom they most believed when they were told things about the environment, very importantly, it was the Canadian Parks Service. The credibility of you, as park managers and administrators, is extremely high in teaching people about the environment. Higher than scientists, higher than environmental groups and so on. So, I think you have a natural role and a very real responsibility to use your parks to educate people about conservation goals and the role of the areas you manage in overall conservation strategies.

Thanks for listening to me. I was genuinely happy to be here.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Jon. We will now open it up for the next fifteen minutes or so to observations or questions of the panel. Ian.

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): After such a stimulating set of presentations, I have to react to, particularly, the last one because it reminds me very much of the things that we have been trying to put into the Green Plan. As a scientist, now turned Park bureaucrat, most of what Jon was saying strikes a very, very dear note to my heart and I am just wondering if we can get him at the Cabinet table when we are presenting that stuff.

The other thing that I wanted to react to was something that Alan said with regard to a national database of information on parks and protected areas. Earlier in this conference, I passed around a document which was entitled, Parks and Protected Areas Chapter of the SOE Report, which is the responsibility of the Sustainable Development Branch and the Federal Department of Environment. That is intended to be that kind of mechanism. I would not say that it is the be all and end all, but it is a step in that direction.

MR. W. BURLEY (New Brunswick): There are just so many things that you have given us to work with, I guess, that it is difficult to concentrate on one thing and come up with a comment, but I have listed a number of suggestions about things I had not even thought of.

There is one question that I wanted to ask Alan. In regard to taking the message to our regional people, if we are going to make some impact out in the field, we have to do a lot of work with them. I know that, in our system, we do. We are still working in parks, I guess, in a very traditional manner in the activities that people do day in and day out, year in and year out, and most of these things that we are talking about today are not even things that are even thought about at the regional level. Has anybody or have you developed a package of material or an approach on seminars or whatever? Is there anything that you know of that is available that we could maybe borrow to model a seminar or something after in order to go out to regional people and getting them to start thinking about where they dump their garbage. I do not even know much about it, but what I do know is not good and, in most cases, again, we are just doing things very traditionally. The closest dump is used without even a moment's thought with plastic bag upon plastic bag and that is just one example. Are you aware of any package of goodies that could help us so that we would not have to start from zero, especially in the smaller jurisdictions?

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): That is an excellent thought, Wayne and, no, I am not. If anybody else in the room is, I would certainly appreciate them bringing it forward. An example that I used yesterday got me thinking along the same lines and it is just a matter of educating, first of all, our own staff to make sure that they understand what is going on.

We had a situation - this gets into the scientific research - where, in one of our parks, we had scientists from an agriculture research station in Regina come out and he wanted to release a

European beetle into an area that had been infested with Canada thistle. The park superintendent was just aghast that anybody would think of introducing this foreign element into one of our parks.

As it turns out, I guess, there are so many foreign elements in so many of our parks and here was something that could help us control another one of them. Really, if we really had had a developed, better-educated staff person in a better-developed system to make those kinds of decisions, then this scientist would not have found it so frustrating. After about three months and four different levels of bureaucracy, we finally put a project together that has produced some very nice results and may have some wider applications.

The first thing for us to do, yes, is to look in our own shops and, hopefully, from the broad kinds of discussions that are going on now, from the development of these kinds of materials more broadly in society, from things that are happening through the Green Plan and so on, maybe that is where we have to look to have those kinds of programs developed that we can apply to our own system. I do not know of anything ready-made. It might be something that the FPPC should look at.

CHAIRMAN: I would just like to make a comment on that as well. We are in a bit of a difficult situation, in terms of being park administrators, with some of these initiatives because we are all concerned with declining budgets and so forth. When you start looking at trying to start utilizing environmentally sound products within parks, you find that they cost more and, at times, quite a bit more. So, as park agencies, I think we have to bite the bullet and set an example and I think we have to be prepared to pay more for some of these things in order to start getting them into our parks and start our park users seeing that there are other ways of doing it. But it costs more money.

MR. N. MONRO: I want to pick up on what Jon had to say relative to encouraging additional scientific research in the parks. This is, I guess, a major hobby-horse that we both have.

One of the things that Jon neglected to mention - and it is not the most perfect process perhaps - but we do have a series of memoranda of understanding between our organization and a number of the universities. What this has done is, at least, provided a catalyst to get the two sides together and put it on the table.

Now, it certainly could be monitored more closely. Probably, the greatest difficulty that we are having in getting people to buy on is to get people at the administrative managerial level to accept this as a significant role for the parks to do. They have other issues and operational considerations that are much more demanding on their time and it is very difficult for them to look at the longer term.

The one thing that we need to stress, when we are talking about sustainable development, is that we are looking at the long term and, no matter what we try to do in setting targets in the short term, we are still looking over the longer term to look at significant accomplishments and, certainly, that is going to be the case, I think, in encouraging scientific research as well. We are trying to get things off the ground and recognize we have a long way to go, but I think we have a good start. Thanks.

MR. J. LIEN (Newfoundland and Labrador): I did forget that, but I knew that Neil would pick it up anyway. He and I have been working on the agreement between Canadian Parks Service and Memorial University. I think we both found it interesting and we find problems that we did not recognize and we find some things that go very easy that we did not expect to.

Someone was saying, yesterday, that there is just not enough money to encourage science to do this, but I honestly think the problems that we have confronted have not been dollar ones. I do not know of any of the scientists who have held back from working in the parks because of dollars. That has not been a major problem.

The problem has been one of communications and expectations on both sides. Universities and park agencies are very different kinds of organizations that operate on different time frames with different sorts of communication processes and what Neil and I have tried to do is break through so we get the relevant people talking. And I think it is working. In ten years, you can ask us if the program was a success. But there should be, over the next period, some very significant research that is good as research and that also contributes, in some cases, to park management needs, but will establish this background of information on parks.

And people are looking at it with interest. Don Hustins is sitting at the back of the room and I have on my notepad today to talk to Don Hustins because one of his staff approached me yesterday and said, "We heard about this agreement between Munn(ph) and Canadian Parks Service; why can we not have that with provincial parks?" And I think, in fact, that would be very good.

Some of the seabird management problems in their sanctuaries are problems that university researchers could help a lot with with no extra money or anything else. It is just a matter of establishing the communication, perhaps, a little more formally.

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): I just want to emphasize how important this last point is, i.e. this matter of agreements between parks agencies and those who have the capacity to do research. It is really the only way that parks managers are going to arrange to get the knowledge that they need to manage their parks properly. The kind of question we were just talking about, the introduction of a foreign species, is a good example of the kind of things that park managers have to deal with and they just do not have the information to deal with that properly.

They tend to deal with each of those issues as a separate issue and, of course, they tend to have broad ramifications down the line. I am reminded of the moving of the diseased bison to Wood Buffalo National Park many, many years ago, which was a decision taken by Cabinet, relatively uninformed and with terrible consequences. We have not, to date, succeeded in getting even a small amount of research. Very recently, a small amount of research has been started on bison genetics, but it is like pulling teeth to get money within government for that kind of thing. There is a school of thought that you do not do research unless it is to answer a specific management question. And if you do not have and cannot pose the management question, it means that you do not do any research.

So, the system just does not permit it to be done internally. CPS used to have a dedicated group within the Canadian Wildlife

Service to do parks-related, biological research, but that was chopped in 1984 and it is not likely to be reimplemented. We have built into the Green Plan some minor step back in the other direction, but, whether it will survive or not, I do not know. We need people arguing that it should survive, but it is clear that, no matter what happens, parks agencies are not going to be able to do those things themselves. The best they can hope to be is informed encouragers of the work of others and then it becomes very, very important to make sure that information is available.

I wanted to ask Jon Lien just one question. He talked about the rate of extinction of species at catastrophic rates, and one hears a lot of that kind of thing these days. While he was talking, I calculated, using the figures that he gives, that it would take about a thousand years to eliminate the 30 million species that are supposed to exist and only a hundred years to eliminate a number equal to the number that we know something about. That sounds pretty serious, depending on your point of view.

But people never seem to talk about the creation of species and, I assume, not being a biologist, that this does occur because we have had catastrophic extinctions in the past and there has been a rebound in terms of numbers of species. I assume this is a slow process, but I wonder why the people who talk about rates of extinction never really talk about what is balancing it off and what it means in terms of time for something observable to happen or something serious to happen. Can you shed any light on that, Jon?

MR. J. LIEN (Newfoundland and Labrador): That is a very good question and, certainly, one that has occurred to people. In E. O. Wilson's edited book on biodiversity, there is, in fact, a chapter on this. The truth is you are predicting evolution which is a random event and so who really knows. Evolution is not a process that has a goal with the creation of some ultimate species or a certain number of species. It is a chance process and so you do not know. The rate at which new species are being found is very high, but you have to remember that at least half of the scientists of all of the scientists who have ever been in the world and who have published anything are now alive. So, we are in a period of incredible scientific activity, but it is very difficult to judge that.

More hopefully, there is something filling the gaps. Maybe starlings and humpback whales will take over the respective area. More importantly in what you said is this thousand year period. To us, as very limited, lifespan creatures, that seems like a long time, but, in geological time, that is nothing now, just a flicker of a neuron. That is a very short time. So, when you are talking catastrophic extinction, it is a period of just absolutely unprecedented change. When you hear people like Stephen J. Gould speak about it, who is a geologist and whose whole life's work has been to look at these changes in geological time, he just says, "I could not have been alive at a better time".

We are in a period where it is happening and I suppose it would accelerate somewhat if they dropped a nuclear bomb someplace, but it is happening so fast and the important thing to a scientist is that the cause of the extinctions are all known. It is because of preemption of habitat by human beings. We are the cause. We are becoming this massively dominant species on the whole planet and we are just shoving everyone else out. What the end result of it is going to be and how fragile the planet becomes with this loss of species that do all of these intricate regulation things, who knows.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would kind of like to make a comment on that point, as well. At times, there has been a limited recognition of the role that evolution and the creation of a new species plays. Kasewik(ph) last year had a draft report on plains bison written that, basically, recommended that plains bison in Canada be put back on the endangered list. Even though there are thousands of plains bison, the vast majority are in ranch situations where natural processes are not acting to mould their genetics and there are only a few hundred or maybe just a few thousand plains bison in public herds that are subject to natural processes. The key point there was that we need herds that are subject to natural processes, so that evolution can continue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It seems to me, from the discussion, that two points stand out. One is the difficulty that we, as managers, have in assessing the relative merits of scientific proposals, in that we do not have, in many cases, the resource assistance that we can turn to and say, "Does this make any sense?"

And the other aspect here that does concern me about the whole issue of scientific research is the quality of the scientists themselves. When I look at the scientific training that people are getting today in the universities, the thing that bothers me the most is that I think we are starting to lose sight of the need for a holistic education. We are becoming such specialists.

When I see some of the proposals that come forward, I remember a fairly eminent individual, who is a botanist, discussing with me the white wolf situation in Northern Elsmere Island, and he said to me, very clearly, that we must preserve these white wolves and do what we can to increase their productivity and to make sure that there are a lot more of them here. And I said, "That may be fine from your perspective, but I have no idea whether there is any sense of balance here".

A good example is that I knew that the peri caribou were in very short supply and man was one of the reasons. Some of our more eminent explorers managed to consume a considerable number of the population in their quest for the elusive north pole.

But the point that really concerned me was this tendency of scientists to focus on a particular aspect, a particular objective. Take the beetle example, they may be eminent specialists in that particular beetle, but what bothers me is: Are they really ecologists or do they have an ecological attitude? Because they are asking me to take a risk in permitting them to undertake some research for which I have no idea what the consequences may be. In many cases, there is no one that I can turn to for the advice as to whether that research makes any sense.

And I suggest to you that there may be an obligation here on the part of the scientific community to take a hard look at their own education and also at the review mechanisms that we put in place. The medical community is facing it right now in the whole question of ethics in medical research. Our ability to manipulate the genes and come up with new genes is getting a little bit scary because we are not quite sure what the implications are.

Now, certainly, the essence of science is risk and you have to take a risk to challenge and to explore, but I wonder what the limits are and how we find the balance to make educated judgments on when to try those scientific experiments for which we have no idea what the implications are.

DR. J. LIEN (Newfoundland and Labrador): That is a really good point. I will not pick up on the business of scientific education. I think that does deserve discussion. Science is reductionistic and that is why it is successful. That you specialize in one species or one process or one specific is the natural thing.

I think the point you raised that park administrators are not generally equipped to judge the science is absolutely correct and that is a major fault in trying now to establish science within parks.

When I do research through a university where I use an animal, I have to go through the Canadian Council on Animal Care or something like that, so that the worth of my research is judged in terms of its impact on the particular animals. I think we need a similar kind of body for judging research in parks because park administrators might say, "I do not care about this beetle, that is crazy, you can study it anyplace", but it may be very important to study it there and it may provide the baseline information you need for later study. Science is a cumulative process, so I build on this beetle study when I do my ecological study and so on and so on.

But I think we do need some kind of scientific body to that understands science very well and also is aware of park issues. I think parks have to be protected from scientists too. I do not know what kind of beetle was going to be introduced, but I would be a little suspicious about that. Or if some guy wants to spray pesticide over all of this area and see what happens or something like that, I think parks have to be protective against scientific activity which can have an impact all its own. And I think it has to be judged by scientists who know the area.

So, I think that is something that will come out of Neil's conference next spring. We will get a Canadian Council on Parks Research which will be a body that park administrators can send proposals for research in their parks to and say, "Is this bona fide, scientific research? Are there implications for management within the park? Will it have an impact on the park's ecosystem?"

CHAIRMAN: We will allow one more and then we are going to have to close it off.

MR. D. HUSTINS (Newfoundland and Labrador): I just have a comment, Jon, in terms of what you were saying earlier. You gave us the indication that communication is perhaps the key between the scientific community and the parks management. And I use a couple of examples that we have had in this province in recent years to expand on that point which, I think, is a very valid one. For example, three or four years ago, in one of our seabird sanctuaries, one of the scientists wanted to come in and collect 20 seagulls on a seabird island. There was no problem, but, when we went through his permit, he wanted to collect those by getting out there with a shotgun and shooting them out in front of whatever might have been; that was his proposal. We, obviously, turned it down. The kind of thing we got into there was: Why do you need to do this in the ecological reserve? What was the benefit of this particular thing of taking those gulls from this particular site by those methods? He, therefore, went elsewhere. He probably got them at a garbage dump down the road somewhere. In fact, I believe that is what he did.

We had a similar situation, a few years ago, in the provincial government where we reallocated 25 or 30 caribou from the Avalon Wilderness Reserve. I would assume there was some scientific basis behind it in terms of how they collected those animals, how they rounded up those animals and transported them down to Maine. Probably a lot of people in the room do not understand what happened here. When the cameras were out there with CBC chasing the caribou, the caribou were panting and virtually falling down around on the ground and, finally, they were given a shot to immobilize them and put them in a trailer to take them off. They were virtually harassing the animals.

So, I think we got into a situation, in both cases, of an understanding of what we should be doing as managers, looking at the public perception, looking at the people who are using the parks and even those people who are not using the parks, of what they expect us to do with the resources that are there and how we should, in fact, allow the scientific community to come in and interact with these things.

So, I think your point, in terms of an understanding of their role and, in fact, of our role, is a very, very wise one.

DR. J. LIEN (Newfoundland and Labrador): Just to go on a bit, one of the things that Neil and I have been doing with the university researchers that go to Terra Nova is that, when they go to Terra Nova, they do their research, et., but we also say, "We want you to put on a number of programs for the park interpretation program." And that opens up a whole new aspect, interpreting the science that they are doing for the park users, and it is very important, because that puts the scientist in touch with the interpretation staff so they are learning what he is doing and they can incorporate that in their program. The scientist, in talking to the administrators and park personnel, begins to realize how the park works and it sort of educates the scientist to park needs.

I do not think there is any reason that park people should trust scientists. We have to be judged on merit like everyone else. Just because you wear that title does not give you any special sort of licence or privilege. That is true in terms of the quality of science and that is true in the kind of communication that we do.

CHAIRMAN: I think we should probably close discussion now. The other workshop is supposed to start at 10:15, and we have an opportunity for a short coffee break.

In terms of the objectives of the workshop, this workshop took a substantively different tack than the one yesterday, so that was kind of refreshing. We fleshed out a couple of the principles in a lot more detail than we had earlier for the Ministers' Meetings, so I think it has been very successful in that light.

I would like you to join with me in thanking our panelists.

JULY 19TH, 1990

MORNING SESSION

WORKSHOP "C"

TWO CASE STUDIES

MR. B. DIAMOND (Director of Parks and Recreation, Department of Lands and Forests, Parks Division, Nova Scotia): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Brundtland Commission defines "Sustainable Development" as that which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. As part of the strategy for achieving "Sustainable Development", the Commission concludes that one action necessary in order to save species in their ecosystems is to continue the establishment of parks and protected areas. The 4 million square kilometres presently protected needs to be increased approximately threefold in order to provide protection for at least a representative example of the earth's ecosystems.

However, the Commission Report states that the historical approach of establishing parks that are somehow isolated from the greater society has been overtaken by a new approach to conservation of species in ecosystems. And this involves adding a new dimension to the now traditional and yet viable and necessary step of protected areas. Development patterns must be altered to make them more compatible with the preservation of the extremely valuable, biological diversity of the planet. Altering economic and land-use patterns seems to be the best, long-term approach to ensuring the survival of wild species and their ecosystems.

The Brundtland Commission, therefore, reinforces the role of parks in the protection of species and habitats, but warns of the need for broader action and, I think, challenges us to consider parks in relation to other resource uses in a much broader context. Throughout this conference, we have been considering the theme, "Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development". The other workshops are considering the Role of Parks in Sustainable Development and Sustainable Development Through Parks Systems Planning.

The conference organizers, through this workshop, have provided an opportunity for us to go beyond the philosophical and theoretical and to look at two concrete examples of Canadian parks which have been considered by parks agencies as having a role in sustainable development. One of these is a very new park here in Newfoundland. Park planner, Bob Halfyard, is going to take us through a presentation on the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve and, in his presentation, he will identify how this park relates to the concepts of the Brundtland Commission.

By contrast, Jake Masselink, the ADM for B.C. Parks, will take us through a presentation on Strathcona Park, which has been in existence since 1911. By examining 80 years of park history, we will look at the role of this park, how it has changed and where it is likely to go in the future.

So, after the presentations, we will have an opportunity for discussion and I would hope that everyone here would participate freely in that. I expect the presentations will take 20 to 25 minutes each. So, about half of our time will be taken up with the presentations and half of our time will be available for discussion.

I had intended to raise some questions that you might consider as the presentations are made; however, the presenters have informed me that they have questions of their own that they would like to put forward to you, so I am going to leave it to them to do just that.

So, without further ado, I will ask Bob to begin. As I said, he is a planner with Newfoundland Parks and, based on the discussions the last evening on the bus, I think, a connoisseur of Newfoundland delicacies. Perhaps, he may share with us some of his secret recipes if the discussion gets a little slow.

PRESENTATION BY MR. BOB HALFYARD

PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Thank you, Barry. Good morning, everybody.

This morning, I would like to deliver my part of the discussion, I guess, in a sort of pragmatic way, in a sense, in that I think yesterday we talked a lot about the theory behind sustainable development and the role of parks in that. Today, I would like to focus in on something that is very practical, the establishment of a new reserve, a new park area, and, in some respects, how that relates to the whole idea of sustainable development. As we have heard, it is not a new term, it is probably new words put on an old concept. And I think the concept is simply common sense. As Voltaire said, "Common sense is not so common." And I think we find that that is true in everyday life.

The first couple of pages of the notes that I have given you are, basically, a quick review of what the Baie du Nord area is all about with a presentation outline following that. What I want to do is, first of all, go over a quick review of our Newfoundland policy regarding wilderness reserves, planning and management, then do a quick review of the reserve process that we have putting these areas in place. I have some slides which show some features about the reserve. I want to do a quick review of public and industry concerns during the time when the reserve is being established and then, finally, to discuss some relationships to sustainable development.

I would also like to encourage participation by everybody because this is a workshop and it should not be just me speaking to you. I think there should be interaction throughout the whole presentation, so feel free to interrupt and ask a question any time you wish. Now, I know, Barry, that is probably contrary to what you have said, but there may be times where a quick question will clarify something during the presentation.

Our provincial parks system has several objectives. We have a preservation and protection objective and we also have an objective to deliver outdoor recreation facilities and opportunities to the public. In addition to that, we have an objective to try to meet heritage appreciation and environmental awareness and, in addition, through our parks system, our reserves, our provincial parks, our day-use areas and our interpretive programs, we attempt to enhance tourism as well.

Wilderness reserves, basically, are set aside by the province and they run so for four different reasons. Most of these reasons are based on the idea of sustainable development to provide continued existence of large areas where people can come to fish, travel and recreate. So, there is a recreation component built into them. It allows areas within the reserve for undisturbed interactions of living things in the environment, so we have that idea of the processes of natural evolution to occur uninhibited and to preserve such large areas, as may be necessary, for the continued survival of a particular species.

Yesterday, we heard Jon Lien talk about gene pools and places where there is an artifact collection of what is natural in a particular area and how it can be preserved for the purposes of study and then to use those areas as benchmarks. So, it meets that objective as well. It also protects areas with primitive or extrodinary characteristics and the Baie du Nord certainly has both of those.

Selection criteria, once again, relates to the four objectives. The area must contain provincially significant and unique endangered species or habitats which are representative of Newfoundland and earth science in general. Also, the site must be sufficient in size to encompass particular features and, if necessary, provide a buffer zone to ensure the integrity of all within. That is a key element of any type of sustainable development concept, to use or to think about a philosophy to adhere to with regard to the establishment of any park. No matter how small or how large, I think we should always give significance to what type of environmental system we are trying to protect in our parks.

Management guidelines are laid down according to the Act and then the management occurs through the different agencies; in this case, it is Provincial Parks, with regards to the wilderness reserve at Baie du Nord. There are other agencies in government which also have management responsibilities, particularly, the Wildlife Division for the wildlife resources in there and some federal departments where you have migratory bird species and several other government departments, as well.

Development is simply not allowed in this wilderness reserve. And that means no recreational or resource extraction facility development in that area.

A process has been established over the years and I should give you a little bit of background before I go into the process. The Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act protects these areas and it was accepted in the House of Assembly in 1980. Previous to that, there had been a number of years where a select committee of government designed this Act and came up with the whole idea of establishing wilderness reserves and ecological reserves under this piece of legislation.

Previous to that, there had been a large wilderness area designated in south central Newfoundland and, through the stroke of a pen of a particular politician at the time, it was wiped off the books and the protection was no longer there. So, some concerned people at the time, at the grassroots level, decided that there was a need for a change. We needed an act that would not permit that to happen and a process that would include all of the things you need to do when you set up a large area like this, public consultation, consultation with the government agencies, with industry, and all of that is built into this process.

I do not need to go through it, but, in the first slide, which shows about half of it, it is interesting to note, of course, that there is a government agency review when a study area is devised and a boundary is sent around to government agencies for their comments. All of this is taken into consideration by the Reserves Advisory Council, which is a group of 11 people appointed by government to advise government on the establishment of these areas, particularly the Cabinet. They have access directly to Cabinet.

In the next slide, the process continues. A preliminary management plan is devised before public hearings are held, so you go out to the public with some ideas on how you want to manage the area, you get their input and you revise that plan according to the input. Once you have established a final plan with final boundaries, you then send the whole thing to the politicians in Cabinet and ask them for their decision.

The decision on the Baie du Nord was long in coming. We had two separate Cabinet proposals go in and we were very fortunate, this March past, that the idea was finally accepted by this current administration. I should not say "finally accepted by this current administration" because this was their first crack at it and they decided to accept it upon first review.

This is a map which does not show where the reserve is in Newfoundland. Because this reserve is so new, we have not had a chance yet to get around to putting it on a map for a slide presentation; at least, I have not. But the Baie du Nord area, as you have seen, is basically located in this portion of Newfoundland, bordered by a road which runs down here and the Trans-Canada Highway coming across, so it sort of occupies that portion of Newfoundland.

I have a few slides now which illustrate some of the natural features that you find in this large area. The area itself is 2,895 square kilometers; do not ask me what that is in acres because I have not figured it out. In addition to the Baie du Nord, sort of on top of it or adjacent to it is a sister reserve called the Middle Ridge Wildlife Reserve and both of those reserves combined give us about 3,500 square kilometers. If you want to start comparing that to something, that is a little bit more than a third of the size of the province of Prince Edward Island, so it is a large area. It is a large area for the island of Newfoundland and it is very significant that such a large area was finally protected in such a way.

One of the main reasons, I guess, for establishing the reserve in that area was the occurrence of ungulates, caribou and moose, especially the caribou population. There are, I would imagine, thousands of caribou in that area in the various herds that roam throughout the barren lands and the Wildlife Division has been very instrumental in assisting the Advisory Council and assisting us in Parks Division in preparing the management plan for this reserve because of their interest in the wildlife resources of the area.

In addition to fauna, there is flora, of course. There are many different types of ecosystems, boglands, mature forests, mixed forests, alluvial fens and all sorts of other different types of ecosystems contained within that large area. You have to realize that that area, in itself, because of its size, does touch upon several major divisions or ecoregions of the province of Newfoundland, the island of Newfoundland, at least. So, because of its extent, it certainly is representative of what is left of a diminishing wild Newfoundland.

This is Smokey Falls on the Baie du Nord River, a marvelous waterfall. I do not think I would want to go over it in a canoe or even a kayak, but the Baie du Nord River is one of the major river systems in the reserve, one of several, but the Baie du Nord is probably the largest. It is also a candidate for a nomination as a Canadian Heritage River. And this falls is wonderful, just with high water. Most times, there is always a wonderful flow of water over that and the canoeing available on that particular river is quite enjoyable.

As we can see, recreational opportunities abound in that area, passive recreation in the form of hiking and canoeing and photography. In addition to that, though, we also allow consumptive activity, such as fishing and hunting.

In addition to natural resources, I guess, in a sense, there are esthetic resources, scenic resources, and I guess they also could be considered natural. This is a shot of Mount Sylvester. There is historical significance to this particular area as well. One of the early inland explorers of Newfoundland, a fellow named Howley(ph), trekked across Newfoundland with a guide - so it is said - and established a cairn on the top of Mount Sylvester. There is still a cairn there, but, whether it is Howley's or not, is in dispute. But, certainly, for the person who likes to photograph, paint and draw, there are plenty of opportunities to have marvelous scenery to portray.

I would like to turn now a little bit to the public hearings because I think they were very important in what we, finally, got as a reserve. Initially, when the area was looked at, I think the Advisory Council sort of adopted, in a sense, a garage-sale approach to this, i.e. let us go after as much as we can and it will get whittled down to really what we want anyway. I do not want to be quoted as to their strategy being that, but that is the way it seemed to occur.

When we went to public hearings, we initially held information sessions in about ten different communities surrounding the reserve. At that time, we presented the preliminary management plan and the proposed boundaries. We spoke to the people about what they wanted, what they thought of the idea, where they thought the boundaries should go and, following that, we then held full public hearings, an independent Chairman was hired, the session was recorded and it was formalized in that manner.

At the time, I guess the general issues that came up were a half a dozen, which included access. They wanted to make sure that access to the reserve would not be restricted as to going in and using the area. There were cabins already in there and they were wondering what would happen to those cabins. The management plan specifies that those cabins will all be removed over attrition in time.

They were wondering whether there would be a permit system installed and, if there was, whether it would be free and accessible. Would salmon enhancement projects be permitted on some of the rivers that are in there? Would economic development occur, not within the reserve, but would the reserve impact negatively upon economic development? And that was a particularly interesting idea that a lot of people in the Milltown, Swiftcurrent and

Clarenville areas were certainly espousing, because they were concerned that the alienation of such a large area for such a purpose may preclude any economic benefits that might come.

We have compromised and slowly communities began to come around, especially the communities on the southern part of the reserve. They seemed to have a very sort of traditional view and affinity with the lower portion of the reserve and they wanted to see some protection on it.

This is what we ended up with. The boundaries were shrunk somewhat; I think the next map may give you an indication of what we initially started with, the grey areas right here and down here and up here and, to some extent, all of this over here, that was what the Advisory Council initially wanted as a reserve there. Because of the information sessions to public hearings, the liaison with the different government agencies, Forestry, Mining, Hydro and other agencies, the area shrunk in size and, of course, ended up being what it is now. So, I am not certain about the total size that was carved off the carcass, shall we say, but I think there will probably be another 1,500 to 2,000 square kilometers that are not in the reserve because of this process. But I feel confident that the area we have secured as a reserve does satisfy that particular objective to have enough of a buffer zone around the four elements that you are trying to preserve and protect.

Just to briefly sum up what the residents were saying. They were saying, yes, protect the area, protect it from mining, hydro and logging, but do not protect it from us. Let us use it because we want to use the area. When we were at one particular public hearing, it was really hot and heavy that particular night. There were a lot of people in the room in this small comunity and, when I arrived for the public hearing, I could not even get a parking space in the parking lot because it was that crowded.

We fitted our way in through the crowd and we sat down and we began the discussion. We were no sooner into the discussion when it really got pretty hot in that room. Everybody was on their feet and several older gentlemen were leading the discussion, if you want to call it that, and we felt a little bit hot under the collar. I was glad that there was a church upstairs where I could probably run for sanctuary if I needed to.

But one old fellow stood up and made the observation that this particular area where, situated to the east of it, is Terra Nova National Park, and then you have a corridor sort of in between and then you have the wilderness reserve to the west, he said, "Here, you guys, you are out here and you are trying to set up a wilderness reserve and you have a national park east of where I live and that is the playground for all the federal civil servants. And now you are setting up this wilderness reserve and that is going to be a playground for all the provincial civil servants."

That comment was really the core of a problem, I think, that exists, in that people feel that these areas are being set up for some elitist group, and I think that is something that we had to overcome by having information sessions and having public hearings.

But, regardless of what anyone said at that hearing or at other meetings that we had, generally, the consensus was that people wanted the heart of the country to be preserved. They believed in preserving the heart of the country. They did not want to see it cut up and that, I think, is the reason why we are all here. I think it is the reason why all of those people out there who supported the establishing of this reserve want to see that reserve preserved and sustained into the future for future generations, not only for users, humans such as us, but the resources and the species that are in there.

Now, to lead into the final part of my discussion on the sustainable development end of this, I just have a statistic on protected areas within Newfoundland. Now, those are not updated because we did not get a chance to do that. We now have two large wilderness reserves. We have the Avalon Wilderness Reserve of 1,070 square kilometers in the centre of the Avalon Peninsula, south and west of St. John's. We have seven ecological reserves now instead of six. We have 359 square kilometers of provincial parks. That number of national parks in square kilometers, the total then would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of about 8,000 square kilometers which, if we want to get into percentages, represents nearly 2% of the province which is now protected, either as a national park, a provincial park, a reserve or some other protected status.

Now, I was grappling with the idea of sustainable development, how the Baie du Nord relates to it, and I have to admit that I was scratching my head in order to come up with some ideas. Having attended the very good discussions that we had here yesterday afternoon with John Lien and the other two participants, it sort of gave me some ideas and, after that, I went and jotted down more ideas after listening to the panel here, and I am glad that I attended that. That is one of the advantages of being involved in these sort of meetings, i.e. you hear ideas from other people and you get to think about them and they are ideas that probably you would not have thought about beforehand or information that you may not have been privy to.

The Baie du Nord's sustainable development has two basic concepts and I think we want to ensure, in establishing the Baie du Nord and other areas, parks or reserves or whatever, that these perform the function of being the balance between major development, i.e. the balance between what is occurring at the urban level and that of the industrial level with those natural resources and those scenic and esthetic resources that we have. There has to be a balance between that.

Also, I think these areas should be sustainable within themselves. It is important that, anytime we establish parks or reserves, we give up a large enough land base. If we cannot give a large enough land base, then we should consider shrinking what we are going to do in there if we are talking about facilities. If we are setting it up to protect a particular feature, then we may not have that option to shrink the size.

I think the role that the Baie du Nord serves in sustainable development has become quite clear to most of us now in the objectives that I put on the slides and our discussion yesterday in the workshops. Obviously, the area will sustain evolutionary processes and we need to do that. It provides research in a living laboratory for scientists. It maintains the biodiversity that is present in that area, in that region. It performs the work of being a benchmark to measure the effects of development in other areas and that is important, especially with regard to how we are going to maintain the entire environment and all of that that is outside of protected status. In regard to the lands that we do want to use for integrated land use, we have to be able to go somewhere and get baseline data that is, at least, as reliable as possible to use to measure what we are doing in that other area that is not protected.

In regard to balanced economic growth, on the one hand, our population is expanding, our industries are expanding, our cities are expanding and we also have to expand, if we can, the areas that we have to protect, the areas where we can go and renew the spirit, where we can renew the body, and I think that is very important. If we are going to sustain ourselves as a race of people on this earth, over the next century or two centuries, I think we are going to need these areas to go and have a clear mind and to think about why we are here. I think that is what wilderness does; it provides that sort of affinity for the humans with all the other species on this earth. Maybe that last comment was rather philosophical, as opposed to being all that pragmatic, but I think it is an everyday concern.

There are certain points to ponder. A couple of things, I guess, personally, are sort of an axe to grind for me. There are a lot of numbers being bandied about now across the country; we want to get 10%, we want to get 12%, we want to get 50%. I do not think we should get ourselves tied into percentages. It is good to have 12% or 15% of the country put into protected status, but you have to look at what that 10% or 12% represents. Does it represent areas that are really endangered or is it just a percentage of the land base in general? Perhaps an ecological approach may be better than just looking at a target percentage.

If you adopt an ecological approach, then you may, in the long run, alleviate some of the problems that can happen with the target percentage approach. What happens when you reach the 12%? Is it a fait accomplis? Is it all over? Do you give up the goal? Do you give up this idea? Does the percentage guarantee adequate protection? As I have said, what does the 12% really protect and is 12% sustainable? If it is 12% or 10% or 15%, what is the magic number? I do not think anyone in this room can answer that. I do not even know if there is an answer to that.

Another problem, of course, with looking at a particular number, 10% or 12%, is the fact that those in the political arena and our friends in industry will certainly say, "Well, you have reached your 12%, you have accomplished it. You get a pat on the back. THere is no need to go any further." So, you have to have a more broad-based approach to establishing these areas and setting aside protected lands.

If you end up with less than your 12%, then, obviously, you want to go for more, but, if you end up with more than 12%, then you certainly deserve a pat on the back.

But, if you adopt an ecoregional approach, then you can, at least, know that you do have some representative of each one of those regions in this country and there are close to 400 in Canada alone, according to some estimates. You could have some sort of representative sample of that protected as a park or a reserve or whatever.

These are just some ideas on ways of ensuring sustainable development through planning and management of reserves and parks. Obviously, adequate land base is one and I have touched on that several times before. We need to ensure that we have true representation of species and habitats within a particular area that we are trying to protect.

In regard to systematic boundary delineation, speaking from our own experience, especially with regard to the Baie du Nord, some of the boundaries that are there are not always based on biophysical data, but are sometimes based on what we said at a public hearing or what somebody suggested, based on cultural features. So, I think we need to take the abiotic, the biotic and cultural features into consideration when you are looking at boundaries for parks and reserves.

The facilities within parks - and, obviously, this does not relate to the Baie du Nord - should be sustainable. There should be a minimum effect of a road in a camping ground and a picnic ground on the remainder of park. If there is going to be an effect, then presumably that should be mitigated as much as possible.

Effective distribution between lands protected and those developed, in other words, means getting back to the idea of the balance. We need the balance.

I will have my final say and then I will shut up and let someone else take their turn. In the final analysis, how do we sustain the natural integrity and the values currently present in the Baie du Nord into the future? I think that is the challenge and one of the best ways of doing that is public advocacy. If we cannot guarantee, in the next 10, 20, 30, 50 years, that there is going to be a core group of people and a majority of people, at least, who live around that reserve, who want that to remain a reserve, I think we run the danger of losing it because, if you do not have support for your parks and your wilderness reserves and your ecological reserves, there is a good chance that you will lose them.

You will lose them out of neglect at the bureaucratic level because budgets are never put in place to properly manage these areas or you will lose them because of an upswell of opposition toward them for some short-term, economic goal. It is important to maintain and sustain any public support that you have for any reserves or any parks now and to make sure that that is passed down to the next generation and the generation after that. I do not need to tell you how to do that because I think everybody in the room knows how we obtained that role.

Thank you.

QUESTION PERIOD

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (off-mike)(inaudible). . .

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I will take the first one that you mentioned. Overpopulation, do you mean humans or like moose and caribou? Hunting and fishing, for instance, is allowed within the Baie du Nord reserve and also in the areas where there are beavers and other types of mammals such as that. The Wildlife Division does maintain the management priority over those and, if it is necessary for them to come in and do a particular study or do something to manage that species so that it is not endangered because of what is happening within the species itself or because of some other exterior cause, then the area and the management plan does allow for that. All they need to do is touch base with us and give us their proposals and then we sit down with them and discuss what they are going to do.

Are there any other questions?

CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Bob. I think that was an excellent and colourful presentation. It will generate some discussion when we get to the point of entertaining more questions and comments.

I think now we will call on Jake Masselink to give us a presentation on Strathcona Park which is quite a contrast, I think, to the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve.

PRESENTATION BY MR. JAKE MASSELINK

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

MR. J. MASSELINK (Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Parks, British Columbia): What I have is really in contrast. The Baie du Nord has just been established, while Strathcona Park was established as a wilderness park in 1911, our first park in British Columbia. It was established by a special act of the legislature and I will get into the details of that in a minute.

Concerning Strathcona Park and the concept of sustainable development, Strathcona is B.C.'s oldest provincial park, as I mentioned, and, as such, I think we can learn from experience here, perhaps. It was established as a wilderness park in 1911. Over the 79 years since it was set aside, in B.C., it has served as the crucible for the refinement of provincial park policy with respect to resource exploitation and protection and with respect to public participation.

Strathecona, with everything that we have been through in over 79 years, has really influenced how we manage our parks system today. So, my presentation will be a chronological account of the resource management history of Strathcona Park. As I take you through it, I would like to encourage each of us to reflect on the question, "What can we learn from the 79-year history to improve upon our management of large wilderness parks as a public trust?" Or perhaps we could ask this another way, "What can we learn from this 79-year history that would significantly contribute to the concept of sustainable development?"

Then I would also suggest that, if you look at sustainable development, you need to look at that in the context of time and space. It requires us to view our situation and the values that we hold today, as individual societies, in both time and space because we do not operate in a vacuum and times and values change. And I think Strathcona will demonstrate that.

You can see where Strathcona park is located, in the centre of Vancouver Island, in relationship to Vancouver and Victoria. Keep in mind also that the south end of the Queen Charlotte Islands are up here, the Moresby is here. I think all of the things that happened at Moresby significantly affected what happened in Strathcona a year or two later. It helped shape public consciousness.

In 1909, Vancouver merchants enjoyed the overflow from the Seattle Exposition. It was at the time when national parks had been established along the CPR routes through the Rockies as tourist attractions and so these merchants in Vancouver said, "We want some of that tourism business" and they urged the government to implement a concentrated and comprehensive tourist attraction plan.

In 1910, Sir Richard MacBride was Premier of B.C. and he had the Honourable Price Ellison, Chief Commissioner of Lands, go to the Buttle Lake area in the centre of Vancouver Island (Buttle Lake is right in the middle of this park) to determine whether the center of attractions could be located there that would attract all of these tourists.

In 1911, the Stratcona Park Act was passed, establishing Strathcona Park. And I will quote you from the Act:

> That it was established in such a way that the land was withdrawn from sale, settlement and occupancy under the provisions of the Land Act or any other act with respect to mining and other matters.

In other words, it was set aside to be preserved as is.

Now, I will give you a little bit of the context here. This is the ENN Esquimalt-Nanaimo railway built. This area was alienated or was all private land and, from here on in, it was public land, Crown land. The boundaries that were drawn cut out most of the big timber in those days. There are still some big sticks left here. So, here we had beautiful Buttle Lake located here and some attractive mountain peaks, but the timber, primarily, was not there.

The park hit the highest peak of Vancouver Island within it. The one on the left is the higher one and that is the Golden Hind, Buttle Lake, Della Falls, the highest waterfall in Canada. Do not ask me for dimensions. It does dry up in the winter when it freezes and in summer if it does not get too much rain, but it is the highest waterfall. And then we have a number of these kinds of things in the park. And as I mentioned, we do have some big sticks in the valley bottom. In fact, most of the old growth forest on the B.C. Coast that is protected today is within Strathcona Park. When you take the size of trees that this gentleman is standing beside, there is a lot of wood fiber there.

At the time, there was talk of erecting hotels, having tourist cruises on the lake with steamers, creating a tourist mecca. Tourism and commercial benefits appeared to be the driving force in setting aside this large area as a wilderness park.

Then, on the basis of a recommendation of a Seattle engineer who was hired to develop this park when he came back and said, "Hold it, folks, you have given us mountain tops and a little bit of a lake, but you need to expand the parks", in 1913, the Parks Act was amended and 100,000 hectares was added to what you see on the map now. The area was 215,000 hectares; it is two and a half acres to a hectare, if you want to convert.

World War 1 changed the government's focus from a promotion of esthetic values and resources for tourism to the exploitation of primary resources.

In 1919, with the return of veterans, employment opportunities had to be created and that did start changing the value and the view that government had. In 1918, before any acquisitions were accomplished and the removal of timber berths that had been granted in the park boundary or within the area that had been established as a park, and before the mineral claims were expropriated, the Park Act was amended. I want to underscore that. Yesterday, we seemed to feel that, if you got legislative protection, somehow there was security. I am just telling you that there is no such thing. Times change.

The park property became open to "the location acquisition and occupation of mineral claims" under the provision of the Mineral Act, not the Park Act. Crown-granted, surface rights could be extended. All claims were subject to the terms of the Mineral Act and the cutting of timber on those claims was permitted. A small number of claims were then staked at Myra Creek - very significant. That was around the 1920 era. We now have the second largest mine in British Columbia operating here with a payroll of 720 people. We will get to that. So, that was in 1920 that those claims were staked and it is at the confluence of this little creek here, Myra Creek on Buttle Lake.

In 1927, another amendment to the Act permitted an applicant to raise the water level of this lake for water storage purposes because there was talk of the development of a huge pulp mill in the area and the Minister of the day is reported to have said that the park was largely an alpine resort, in any case, and that mountain climbing and other sports, for which it was suited, would not be effected by the power development.

Now, the development was not carried out at that time. The area was managed under the Forest Service.

In 1929, a number of recorded mineral claims increased. And then we have the Second World War and, in 1940, some work now was taking place on these mineral claims, particularly the Sherwood Claim in the Drinkwater Valley. However, in 1942, because of the shortage of manpower resources, things came to an end as far as mining development was concerned.

In the late 40's, the idea of damming the lake came forward again. The public, in 1951, became aware that the B.C. Power

Commission was proposing this power development and it was to provide all Vancouver Island's domestic and industrial facilities with power. Those supporting the expansion argued that, since an access road to Buttle Lake would necessarily have to be built by the Power Commission, far more recreationists would have access to this park. So, it was looked upon as a plus.

There was some public concern. Legislature appointed a special commission to look at the situation. The need for hydro power prevailed and, in 1953, the Commission ruled that the Power Commission be allowed to proceed and dam the lake, Campbell Lake and Buttle Lake. The head upper Buttle River was dammed and Buttle Lake became a reservoir.

This is a bad shot, but Buttle Lake is here, this is the park, and it extends north here. This is Campbell Lake which serves the community of Campbell River with power and water. This is looking west and the road to Gold River is through the park here.

So, we now have a gigantic reservoir, which caused a fair amount of public stir and the local magistrate, Roderick Haeck Brown, who is revered, I guess, in British Columbia, as a renowned naturalist, really took it upon himself to now raise the issue and that is when Strathcona started to become a public issue, in 1953.

And you can see that they did log it, which was nice. We have some reservoirs that were not logged and you can see that the draw-down period at the end of August through to the spring is not all that pretty. I will get to this in a minute.

In 1957, the Strathcona Park Act was repealed. The parks agency was taking out of the forest service and put into a Ministry of Recreation and Conservation. A new Act, the Recreation and

Conservation Act, was established and the park was reclassified to a Class A park. This classification, at that time, permitted prospecting, claim staking and mining, but under authority of the Park Management Agency rather than under the authority of another Ministry.

In 1961, Western Mines purchased those claims at Myra Creek and developed the mine, as you see it here. It was an open pit mine to start with and then it went underground. The tailings were dumped into Buttle Lake and Buttle Lake is the water source for Campbell River. They found that the heavy metal content went up, the fish population went down and, of course, the mine was accused because of the tailings that were dumped in it.

What they found out later was that this rock is high in sulphur content. You have a tremendous problem in British Columbia with acid mine drainage. There is a bacteria that needs a little bit of oxygen, a little bit of moisture and a little bit of sulphur, and it then produces sulphuric acid in large quantities and it was really the drainage of the acid out of the open pit that put the heavy metals in the rock there into solution and then that drained into the lake.

As far as the tailings that went into the lake were concerned, the bacteria could not get at that, but they did not find that out. So, they were forced to put their tailings into big tailing ponds and so what we have here now is an eternal timebomb just ticking and it cost them, I think, about a million dollars a year just to neutralize the acid coming out of their tailing ponds. When that mine is gone, that is what we are left with. Just keep thinking about this sustainable development and the whole idea of having a wilderness park.

What is the name of that mine? Western Mines, called Westmin now. I would also keep in mind that it employs 720 people and it is a large mine. Here is some more of it, they are all underground now. It is not a pretty sight. It used to be a beautiful lake, but, with it, of course, you have the ore coming in and out on this road that made the park accessible to recreationists and, of course, these guys are paid on time. When you are driving your camper along and you get one of these things up your backside, it really scares you. There are 120 loads per week that come out of that mine.

Another thing that took place within the park was that there were areas in the park that were not being used and we were short of cash to buy new parklands, so we thought that we would use a little bit of Strathcona in exchange and use the resources there. So, this is the Beddewell(ph) Valley and it was one of the valleys that had old growth in it, so we exchanged the timber in that for land that we bought at Long Beach, which became national park later on. So, this valley was high-graded and that was our doing and you can see how we high-grade things. But we got a nice piece of land down Wikaninish(ph) Beach for that.

The other thing that you find with parks is that, no matter where you locate them, they are always in the way. People want roads through them and then they want power lines through them, so there is B.C. Hydro with a nice swathe going through it. It does not look very pretty, but, at the same time, you are now managing something that you did not want, but the public did.

We did add another piece to the park for recreational purposes, Paradise Meadows, next to the biggest ski hill on Vancouver Island, Mount Washington. This is that area here and you can see where Westmin is located. Then we added a piece at the north end for recreational purposes and Gold Lake was added. So, over time, that park grew a little bit.

We did get a Parks Act of our own and it was shaped by the experience that we had in Strathcona Park and we now set aside a Class A park as a place where you do not log and you do not mine. In a Class B park, you can log and mine. And then you have things like recreation areas if you do not like the term "Class B park". And to really protect things, we call something "nature conservancy areas".

All of them were located in Strathcona Park to try to safeguard the most valuable parts of the park, but we did go ahead and exchange more timber for land that we added to the parks system elsewhere. Cape Scott Park at the north end of Vancouver Island was paid for by timber out of the Class B portion of this park. Rathtrevor Beach, a very popular resort type beach near Parksville, came out of here, etc., so we got some really valuable additions to the system.

Now, we will get to the interesting part and I am told I have a couple of minutes, so I will get on with it.

The areas that we logged were in here, and here, and here, for exchange for those areas that we added to the parks system elsewhere. Then we said, "Let us knock these things out now that we have bought the timber out of them" and so we went forward to the government and said that we would like to knock these out and, at the same time, we wanted to reclassify areas within the park with mining claims on them to recreation area status so that people can either prove up their claims and get out or prove them up and develop them.

The government turned this over to a commission that, amongst other things, looked at this and other areas. The Commission came back and said, "Good idea, but why not take it to the public first. We have a Minister that says okay to the public. We will have public hearings before we make any decisions". He was replaced two months later with a Cabinet shuffle and the next guy came along and, when he was asked by the conservationists around here, "Are you going to hold these public meetings?", he said, "Yes". He quit because of a kind of scandal and a third guy took over, who also said "yes", so you had three Parks Ministers who said, "yes".

The third one then found himself in a pinch. Now, how do I deal with it? If I go public, the public will probably want me to roll back the boundaries or leave the boundaries the way they are. So, it was in his wisdom and, I guess, Cabinet's wisdom that they did not hold public meetings, but went ahead with an order-in-council and cut these areas out. At the same time, we were told to issue park-use permits for the development of mining claims. So, we issued an exploratory permit to Queen Silver, next to Westmin, in an area that had been burnt out because of a forest fire, and all hell broke loose. Now, this was right after South Moresby.

What happened after that was that the people came to our Minister and said, "The mine is going to pollute the water system even further here if you develop this for Campbell River". It is at the height of land and also serves the water system of Port Alberni and the water system through here of Courtenay, so you have three communities, all of a sudden, concerned about the pollution of their water. Then, cnce they had their attention on Strathcona, they said, "Well, is a park not a park? You do not log and you do not mine in a park".

The company went ahead to try to drill and we had the Friends of Strathcona block them on the road where 64 people were arrested in the process and their demands were very simple. "We want the boundaries rolled back, we want public hearings, we want the park boundaries legislated so that there will be public participation guaranteed, at least in the House, anyway, before you make any changes, and we want no logging and no mining." And this is what they focused on, very much like our last speaker, that you are taking the heart out of Strathcona. It was interesting to hear your comments about the heart of the country. That became the slogan. They are cutting the heart out of Strathcona. This is all mineralized andit is very pretty country.

The result was that the government, our Minister, did appoint an independent committee to hold public hearings and the committee came back and made those recommendations: legislate the boundaries, can logging and can mining. Our Minister got together with the Minister of Mines and then established government policy that there would be no logging and no mining in any provincial park. All parks had their boundaries legislated as a result, as soon as a master plan was completed. This park now has a legislated boundary and we are in the process now of buying up all mineral claims.

So, that is the long and the short of it. We have gone sort of full circle with Strathcona, but it is interesting to look back over 79 years and say that it started off with the idea of having a wilderness park and see what we have gone through. And government, I do think, represents the value that the public places on things.

This is the final boundary of the park. We now have two parks, Strathcona Park, which is in green, and Strathcona Myra, which is really the area that the mine is in. There was no way that anybody was going to close down the mine with 720 people working there. So, that park will continue on as a mine and this park remains as a wilderness. As I mentioned, it is well over 500,000 acres, so it is a very, very large park.

Now, I have rambled a little bit, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

QUESTION PERIOD

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Jake. I will ask both of our presenters to join me back at the table here. Again, I think that it was a very fascinating presentation for a number of reasons.

The remaining time is fairly short for discussion, but I expect that the people here who have seen these presentations would like to comment and question and make observations about the kinds of lessons that we can take from these presentations relative to the conference theme on sustainable development. So, without further ado, I will open it up for you to participate in the discussion on these presentations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe I could start, Barry. I wonder if both speakers would comment on the concept of select cutting in the logging industry versus clear cutting and whether it came up in either case as a trade-off to allowing the logging companies into the parks. Did it come up at all and what was their response? What was the industry's position on it? What was the public response to that if it did come up?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): That problem really did not arise with regard to the establishment of the Baie du Nord Reserve mainly because, during the referral process early on in the establishment process that I showed, the Advisory Council and the Wildlife Division at the time had negotiations with the Department of Forestry, provincially. I guess the bottom line, within the Baie du Nord Reserve itself was that the forest resources in there maybe did not have the commercial viability that was required by the government and by the companies.

There were no access roads and I think we probably got in there at the right time. We got in there before it became necessasry to go in and harvest what was in there. Now, I am not entirely sure if that is the correct answer because these negotiations go back to 1982, and it precedes me, but I believe that was the case.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): In B.C., I am a forestry graduate and I do not know quite how to respond to that because what you are dealing with in the Strathcona Park is old growth, trees that are between 200 and 300 feet high in the valleys; selective logging just does not work. That is what the industry says.

Our position is - especially now, with old growth, which has become a very, very focused issue in British Columbia because, of course, the industry is virtually mining our wood fibre - is that what we are removing, we will never see it back. Those trees are 400 or 500 years old and we will never see them back. Do we really understand what we are removing? And if we do not understand what we are removing, how much should we leave in place? Strathcona, which was established in such a way in 1911 so that most of the old growth was left out to be logged, now is your main source of protected old growth, and so there is definitely no logging in that park. Any politician who would suggest that today would be hung.

MR. G. TRANTER (Alberta): Bob, in your comments, you indicated your strong feeling for the support of public advocacy for sites, such as the Baie du Nord. Do you have or are you contemplating a public advisory group in either one of the parks that you have just described? This questio is for either speaker.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Yes, with regard to our two major wilderness reserves, and I will just mention the Avalon Reserve first. We have established a Management Advisory Committee and that is made up of people who live around the reserve and also people who represent NGOs, conservationists, associations, etc. In addition, we have a couple of government representatives on that committee, and it comprises about seven or eight people.

The Baie du Nord was established on March 16th of this year and we are now in the process of getting around to establishing such a committee for the Baie du Nord, which would have a somewhat similar composition. Our intention with these committees is to meet on maybe not so much of a regular basis, but, certainly, to meet two or three times a year or as need be in order to discuss issues regarding the management of those reserves. We think that is going to work. It is a strategy that guarantees that you bring in the local communities and the people are then stakeholders in the preservation of that area.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I really think that you are touching on the nub of the issue and one which the panel, yesterday, touched on. Arlin, I think you said it best when you said that parks need to be established with a long-term commitment and, for protected areas to survive, they need to be supported on an ongoing basis by the local residents.

From what we have learned at Strathcona, when these public hearings took place, the industry said nothing; the mining industry said nothing and the logging industry said nothing. I met with them privately, off the record, and I asked them why they did not participate. They said that, with the media there, they did not have a chance and would be castigated.

So, that meant that I had to find a way to get them at the table and I have difficulty with Advisory Committees, to be honest with you, because I believe it is our mandate to manage. But how do you get a participation of all the stakeholders? In this case with Strathcona, B.C. Hydro needs to be at the table, both for the reservoir and with their power line. B.C. Highways needs to be at the table because of the way they maintain the roads. The Westmin Mine needs to be at the table. The companies that own land right adjacent to the park and those companies that own rights adjacent to the parks need to be at the table. The municipalities need to be at the table and your advocacy hiking clubs, your environmental clubs need to be at the table.

So, we are working on a master plan right now and we want to come out of that endeavour, not just with a masterplan, but also with some sort of an informal group of people who meet at least once or twice with our District Manager in public and with the media there because, now that we have everyone's attention, we need to capitalize on that.

I also believe that other agencies in government need to be there. The Ministry of Mines needs to be there. The Ministry of Forests needs to be there. So, you are looking at a big group. In sustainable development, that is why we put on the whole picture of Vancouver Island, because we need to look, in our case, at Strathcona in terms of the larger area and what is going on.

The local ski hill operator needs to be there. You have a large number of people who are directly involved and you do not operate in isolation. We impact on them and they impact on us and we need to do that in public. The union needs to be there.

When you start looking at the number of people who really need to be there, they all need to commit themselves to the fact that that park is important to maintain the way it is and that it is important to society. That is what I was getting at yesterday. Everyone has to commit themselves to the fact that parks are a value to society and I believe that everyone needs to be involved in shaping what our parks look like tomorrow.

If they do not participate, they are not committed. I am being kind of opinionated, but I really feel strongly about that. It is going to take a lot of effort and a lot of work, on our part, to orchestrate that. And I would like to remove that as far away from the political realm as possible so that it is a naturally developing kind of process.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): If I could just make a comment before Gary asks his question. Another strategy that we have employed recently is that, in addition to having committees help us manage our parks, we also have begun having workshops. We did one a couple of months ago to help us manage our seabird reserves and we have a number of them, one, in particular, where there are a lot of tour boat operators. Shelley Bryant and I organized such a workshop and we invited all the people, who operate tour boats and who have a concern such as that, to come along and share ideas on how to manage in this area.

So, if you do have, as Jake has indicated, a lot of stakeholders, they do not necessarily have to sit on a committee. You can bring them in once or twice a year, certainly once a year, sit them all down and have a conversation. What are the problems? What do you think is going right or going wrong? And I think it is important to do that because you have to build a public advocacy, not only at the grassroots level, but you also have to bring in the people who sit around the political and industrial board tables, as well.

MR. G. SEALY: My question is more in the form of a comment. I am not sure that provincial resource agencies are really competent to direct parks to sustainable development goals. The Strathcona example is maybe a bit more obvious than the Algonquin Parks example, where logging continues after nearly a hundred years. The parks agencies are squeezed so much by the resource agencies and it reminds me of a discussion I had with Lloyd Brooks, the

Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests in British Columbia, who talked about the weight of the big companies on him. I am unable to really give him very much policy room so he could share with the public the consequences of certain land-use choices in the parks.

It seems to me that the national, non-government organizations have a very important advocacy role, which is not being met, and, more than that, an educational role to help provincial parks and national parks develop educational programs for the public, which I do not think that the parks agencies themselves are able to do because they are blocked by the executive stakeholders, by the owners, really, of the land and of the natural resources and, unless there is improved public education, I do not think that we are going to make this work. I do not think that the parks are going to be able to be directed to long-term sustainable goals.

So, I do not think that it is enough just to establish the parks. The public has to be educated to the consequences and I do not see, nationally or provincially, very much improvement in public education programs vis-à-vis sustainable development or parks.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I agree with you in some parts, but I disagree with you in others. I agree with you that we need the advocacy of the public groups. In Strathcona, we lost control to the advocacy groups and you cannot manage in that situation. We had to get in front of it and it took a great deal of diplomacy on my part between groups to win their confidence that I was trustworthy and had no ulterior motives.

I do believe that it is the non-profit organizations that have really piqued public consciousness in the west. That is why I mentioned Moresby. When you have people willing to be arrested - and the same thing happened then in Strathcona with people of all political persuasions - that is what then starts to focus the public on what we are doing with our resources. But, while that is developing, you have to watch that the pendulum does not swing to those groups that are going to restrict what these parks are for, because these parks belong to everyone in society.

The tourism groups wanted, at the beginning, to create a park to milk tourists and then you have the industry around it, at a later date, that say, "Hey, we are logged out, but there are some big sticks over there so let us do some selective cutting". So, I think you need all of society.

I agree with you that the non-profit organizations need to keep on going, but now we need to build on that and capitalize on that. That is my feeling. If you have the municipalities, the municipal councils who represent the local people, on board too, then you have solid support.

Also, when you have fought for something and when you have been arrested for something, it will last. It is an unfortunate thing, but nobody is going to touch South Moresby and nobody is going to touch Strathcona, not after the price that people have paid to have it protected, and that comes from your non-profit organizations. So, we need to go beyond that is what I am saying.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jake, I am just interested in following up the comments you made about the Public Advisory Committee group. If I understood what you are saying, your comment was that the

Public Advisory Committee tends to be too restrictive. It does not, without some fairly cumbersome procedures, really include all the stakeholders that need to be included to reflect both the public responsibility that the government has to the entire population and also, strategically, to deal with all the interests that really will be influencing the area. I just wanted to confirm that I understood you correctly.

What then is a way to proceed to organize that discussion? After a fairly tense and successful struggle over Strathcona, I assume that there is some danger that it can slip away into the shadows again if there is not a continual effort led by the managers to consolidate the gains made and to keep public awareness up about the benefits of the area. There is some danger that, in another 10 to 15 years from now, this scenario can arise again of competing interests, once again, claiming or trying to reclaim some of the territory. It sounded like you were talking about a possibility of an annual or some kind of periodic, public discussion about the state of the park and what its current issues and benefits are. Is that the way you would like to proceed? Is that the way you are proceeding with Strathcona?

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Yes, and the reason for that is that I find that the minute you establish an advisory board or commission, you lock yourself into something that is rigid and bureaucratic. What we found with Strathcona, on both sides of the issue, was a lack of understanding of how each impacted on the other.

The environmentalists felt disenfranchised. They were promised public hearings. We did not try and so the result was that they no longer trusted the government and that agency who just issued a permit to a mining company. So, we had a credibility gap and that became the main problem. It took, as I mentioned, a lot of diplomacy on my part to win their confidence back. I was able to say things off the record as to where I was going and taking things to.

Then, when we got a few of the players together and they saw us putting things together, they started to understand the implications of doing things. They are now starting to listen to each other and they are now much more interested in how we are impacting on industry. Industry, on the other hand, is turning to them and saying, "We want to manage the area adjacent to Strathcona Park; come with your suggestions as to how we should manage those access valleys". So, it is coming together if we can keep that informal, flexible nature.

I think the key is to keep it in the public mind and I think the Baie du Nord is the same way. If you have the communities who are directly impacted and participating regularly, not in some rigid fashion. But I found that Advisory Committees like to do what a lot of staff do, get involved with the operations, and I do not want them involved in operations. Leave that to us.

But I do want people from outside involved in where we are going and what we must safeguard. If you can link that in with, say, stated public policies by the government or the Minister of Parks responsible for parks who says, for instance, "We will have a master planning process that will be published and everyone will be participating", there are other safeguards that you can put in place to help that process. Things may change, but that is my view.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): This past year, we saw the beginning of the first Parks Day in Canada. It was the brainchild of the FPPC and we need a lot more Parks Days in this country. It is fine to have a National Parks Day, but I think the most value that comes from that sort of promotion is having a local Parks Day at the community level and the idea can be filtered down to those communities around the Baie du Nord Reserve or Strathcona Park that there is a day set aside when you visit the park and activities are going on in the park that you would want to participate in.

You could have open forums where people sit down and talk about the park, and that occurs on an annual basis. We have a better chance of ensuring that, into the future, public advocacy continues to build and is always there. People need to constantly be reminded of the wonderful resources they have on their doorstep. We come and we visit other places, as many of you have done in coming to Newfoundland. People have said to me that it is lovely here, but we who live here tend not to see how nice it is. All of us need to be reminded about how wonderful it is on our own doorstep, as well.

MR. G. MILLEY (Newfoundland and Labrador): ...(off mike)... You both seem to be suggesting public advocacy and you have demonstrated how you have been involved in the process, in terms of change, and assisted in shaping new policy and, indeed, terminate that your . . .(inaudible). . .protected. . .(inaudible)

. . . You are both talking about public advocacy as a support, but the . . .(inaudible). . .obviously, looking at 79 years at Strathcona, you are dealing with a wealth of experience and time . . .(inaudible). . .but, in this instance, the process . . .(inaudible). . . is probably, you know, looking at that natural situation. . .(inaudible). . .I will just ask my question. Are you both really of the same role for public advocacy . . .(inaudible). . .?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I am not sure if I understand your question. Are you asking if both Jake and I agree on the same ways and means of achieving public advocacy?

MR. G. MILLEY (Newfoundland and Labrador): . . .(off mike). . . (inaudible). . .

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Oh, okay.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): As I mentioned, it depends on the situation. With Strathcona, we lost control. You cannot be a management agency, holding something in public trust, and not be in control and that was because the public had lost trust in us to be able to manage it. Those were a couple of black eyes that we received and that was terrible and really woke us up.

What I am saying is that that is where your non-profit, advocacy groups are invaluable, i.e. to keep the agency honest and to keep the government honest, which is fundamental because, without it, we cannot survive.

The other thing that I would like to highlight is the importance of the media and that comes back again to having advisory groups. The minute we make a statement, the media automatically goes to industry, gets a quote from them and then it goes to all the other agencies. Somehow, we need to keep that alive too because, in that way, things remain balanced. I think the media has played a very, very good role in many, many instances.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Gary, just to quickly answer, yes, obviously, I agree with the idea of public advocacy and more of it. During the process for the Baie du Nord, we held public hearings and we held information sessions before that. In addition to those meetings, you had to realize that there were other meetings going on - I would not say under the table - but there were meetings held with local groups, with individuals and with key communities whom we were trying to, not so much win over, but present the case, for and against, establishing this area. So, the public advocacy is not only done in a public forum and, in one particular instance, it was done around a guy's kitchen table in a small community while we were eating bottled rabbit. So, that is what you have to do. You have to be able to be flexible enough to get out and do your public advocacy in many different ways.

MR. G. MILLEY (Newfoundland and Labrador): . . .(off mike). . . (inaudible). . .

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Certainly, because our Wilderness Reserves Act in Newfoundland stipulates that no established reserve can be changed with regard to its boundaries or its size, nor can a significant management policy be changed without having a public hearing. And that is enshrined and built into that Act.

Now, that is not to say that Acts cannot be changed, but, as far as the Act is concerned, we always had to go back to the public and that is one of the things that protects the areas more so than not having that there, of course.

or the moment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jake, just a general question. You probably thought about it a hundred times after everything you had been through. If you had a chance to go back and do it all over again, from a Parks Branch point of view, as far as building advocacy, locally and provincially, would you have taken a different approach or could you have taken a different approach?

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): No, I think there were too many factors that pushed us into the position that we were in. I am not so sure. I do not look back and ask myself if we could have taken a different approach, that is hindsight. I believe that the good Lord gave us two eyeballs to look ahead and not drive with a rearview mirror in front of us.

But there is one thing that you have to keep in mind here which applies to the parks and ecological reserves across the country. You have just had issues like South Moresby before Strathcona reared its head, and you had the arrest there. In South Moresby on the Queen Charlotte Islands, they wanted to establish it as a national park and people were being arrested there and saying, "No way are you going to log this". So, that had already focused and influenced public concern about where we were going.

Then, when this came along, we were very surprised. People were prepared to get themselves arrested, 64 of them, old ladies, young people, everybody. It was a deep, personal commitment and not just from that area. People living in Vancouver went there, volunteered and they were from all political persuasions.

The outcome of it is - and I think this is really important - that what people fight for will last a lot longer. If I can draw an analogy, maybe our good friend from the U.S. may or may not support me on this, if you look at, for instance, the commitment that people in the U.S. have to their country, compared to us, they had to fight and shed blood and we never had to shed blood. I think the same principle holds when it comes to South Moresby. Nobody is going to touch South Moresby. People have paid a high price there. I do not think anybody is going to touch Strathcona for a long time. There has also been a high price paid.

So, coming back to whether we have done it another way, I do not know, it is a rhetorical question, but I think what took place there was really valuable in influencing how we as a society are changing our values. That is my view. And I think it is going to take a few more of these. You have the same kind of thing in Ontario. Now that communication is instant, both in what you hear and in what you see on television, Strathcona is not that far away and Baie du Nord is not that far away when you live on the other side.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): Thank you both for excellent presentations. I guess the obvious question in my mind is the lesson, which Bob summed up in public advocacy and Jake was certainly saying that it was the public that turned things around. What are your agencies going to do now to ensure that ongoing public advocacy? Are you going to take an active role in ensuring that there will be an ongoing sense of public responsibility and advocacy?

Obviously, Jake, I think your case, over the years, represents it. The public came and went in terms of their interest and they were satisfied or put off or deceived, depending on the circumstances, but the one thing that did not happen was that there was no sort of consistent development of public advocacy. I guess maybe, from the case of a long history and from the case of a short history, you could just give us some ideas there.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I guess there is a strategy of three things that we could employ. First of all, I would like to point out that, with regard to public advocacy and public concern and support for wilderness reserves in Newfoundland, we have a process enshrined in our Reserves Act. In other words, we cannot change the boundaries of a reserve, the management policies or designate a reserve without a public hearing. So, it cannot be done in the dark of the night by some simple signature. You have to go to the public, so the public is guaranteed to be involved.

Secondly, what our management plans called for with regard to the Baie du Nord and other reserves is the establishment of management advisory committees. These generally are made up of individuals who live in communities that surround the reserves, people from non-government organizations who are concerned with parks and wilderness and some government employees as well. So, there is an outreach at the community level to let people know why the reserve is there and how it is managed, so that problems that do arise can be brought to the managers of the reserve through this committee or directly to us.

Another thing that we have just recently begun is to hold, on occasion, workshops to deal with issues that relate to specific reserves. We held one, a couple of months ago, that dealt with tour boat operators who operate near our ecological seabird sanctuaries and we brought those people together for a day where we discussed the whole issue of how this reserve was impacting on their operations, what were some of the things that they would like to see us instigate with regard to public information about these reserves and how to operate, various things like that.

Hopefully, we can expand that to include maybe an annual workshop for the Baie du Nord where you would bring together all the stakeholders on government's side, on the public's side and on industry's side and have everybody sit down and discuss the management issues. I am not saying that that can always work, but, certainly, there is no harm in trying. It seemed to have worked quite well, so far.

So, those three things, the province has in place and can put further in place to ensure that that public advocacy role is sustained over time because, without it, it is highly unlikely that you are going to have, as Jake said earlier this morning, that reserve there 20 to 30 years down the road. Unless you have the public support to keep it there, there is a good chance you might lose it.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I agree with that. We were asked in the previous workshop whether we would appoint a local Advisory Committee for a park like that and my response was that I would guard against that. I would much rather have it somewhat informal within a sort of structured mechanism. We do not by Act, but by policy, require public participation in the preparation of all of our master plans.

And that is a developing thing. We used to develop master plans on our own where we would go out to a few clubs and ask people what they thought. Then, we would manufacture the plan and, internally, sign it off, no publicity. We ran afoul and so now we hold public meetings. Well, who comes to public meetings? You do not find anyone except your environmentalists and your outdoor recreation clubs coming to public meetings. The industry does not come because the press is there and they try to look for issues.

Now, what we are trying to do, learning from Strathcona, is to say that whatever we do in the park now impacts on a mine with 720 people employed there; on Hydro, who have an image to maintain; on companies that log around the park and, because of the advocacy success in B.C., those companies have been sensitized. We are at the right stage now, saying "Hey, folks, maybe we should all get together".

If you now look at all the elements that are impacted here, besides the ones that I have mentioned and the various companies, at least three logging companies, Westmin Mines, Hydro, you also have the downhill ski operation that needs to be involved. The communities that draw their water source from the park need to be involved, along with the municipalities. You also have to cut in the B.C. Forest Service that manages the forest, the B.C. Wildlife Branch and the Highways Department.

That is why I wanted to make a point of sustainable development. We are working together and not in isolation. We are working together and we need to be aware of how we impact on each other. We found, through this experience, that the environmentalists had taken the control out of our hands. They were now, through the media, running that park and we were on the run. We had to get ahead of them and that meant that we had to regain their confidence and trust.

You asked whether we had regained it. The jury is out. They are saying, "Let us see the master plan and then we will see how you implement and manage that master plan". We are happy with what we have seen and relationships are warming up, but they are on guard and I am advising them to stay on guard because only then will all the players be forced to come around the table and manage, not only what is in the park, but around the park, with the best interest of the public in mind.

So, out of all of this, out of the two black eyes, we have learned a lot and it is really shaping government's thinking on both sides of the House and it is really shaping our thinking, as well as that of the environmentalists and the companies.

The companies now come to us and say, "How can we get together? How can we all work together?" So, there are many, many pluses. It took a little bit of sacrifice and, looking at the parks system as a whole, that has been the sacrificial lamb within our parks system and, out of it, there is a lot more that is being set aside and protected.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): My questions are not very profound, so that is the reason why I did not want to preempt somebody with something important to ask. I just want to complete my information on the Baie du Nord.

First of all, I would like to know the difference between the Wilderness Reserve and the Wildlife Reserve. You allow hunting and fishing in the Wilderness Reserve; is it allowed in the Wildlife Reserve or is that one of the distinctions?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): The main distinction between the Wilderness and the Wildlife Reserve is one relating to mineral activity. Within the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve, there is no mining activity permitted, exploration or extraction. However, when they were establishing this whole area, the Department of Mines realized that there may be commercial mining resources in the area of the Middle Ridge, which now constitutes the Wildlife Reserve. So, they made a Wildlife Reserve there and, under the Wildlife Act, you can explore and extract minerals in an area. So, if, over time, for instance, it is found that, through commercial exploration, there are enough sufficient reserves in that Middle Ridge area to be mined, then that area will become part of the Wilderness Reserve. So, that is the main distinction. However, you can hunt and fish equally well under permit in either reserve.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Are they managed by different agencies?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland): Yes, they are. The Wilderness Reserve is managed by the Parks Division of the Department of Environment and Lands and the Middle Ridge area is managed by the Wildlife Division of the same Department.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): The second question has to do with the no-development precept. You said no development when you referred to campgrounds, but, later, you made some reference to access roads, comfort stations, etc., so I assume there may be trails. When you say no development, do you mean absolutely no development?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I think what I said was no development. If I mentioned access roads and comfort stations, I do not think it was in relationship. . .

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): (voice over voice). . .Well, it was later in a more general context, but I was not sure whether it applied to the Baie du Nord.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): No, no. If you misunderstood me, certainly, I did not mean that there would be any such things inside the Baie du Nord.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Right. So, you provide a road to get to it and that is it?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): There are no roads to get to it now, essentially. No, there is nothing planned, certainly, not within our Department or in government in general, to build any access roads to the reserves. There are a couple of roads that do come close to the reserve, especially in the northern part of it, and there are ATV trails and skidoo trails and hiking trails that lead into the reserve, but there are no plans to build any access road to it.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): The third question has to do with the selection of the term "reserve" as opposed to saying, "preserve". But to me a reserve implies a temporary or interim condition like a military reserve or a petroleum reserve, etc. I wonder if any particular thought went into the selection of the term "reserve" or whether it was just selected at random, whether or not it might have implications later on as to the temporary nature of the thing.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I believe the term was probably selected at random. I am not sure exactly what the surroundings were at the time and the circumstances regarding why it was called a Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act, consequently, "reserves" as opposed to "preserves". I think maybe we followed the European example, especially in England, where they tend to call things "preserves"; the North American example seems to be to call things "reserves", so I think it is just a matter of preference in wording.

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Our preference is for the "preserve" as we use it to mean the highest degree of protection.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Sanctuary is another word that would probably be synonymous, but preserve. . .(voice over voice). . .

MR. N. LANDRUM (Florida): Ironically, the U.S. National Parks Service adopted the term "preserves" so as to denote a lesser degree of protection than the National Park. We allow hunting and mining and what not. Thank you.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): I wanted to ask Bob a question and I guess I was going to try to challenge a little bit, not because I want to be difficult, but because I thought somebody should play devil's advocate a little bit here.

So, you have a brand new area that you have just set up and you have hunting in it. Essentially, that is an extractive, right? Is that not just the first step in everything else that can happen? Does that not mean that there will be roads, campgrounds, mineral explorations and so on and so forth. Can you call it a Wilderness

Reserve and allow people to go hunting in there or is that one of the compromises you have to make to get it in the first place?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): You can look at that from two viewpoints. You cannot say, yes, it was one of the compromises. I think there would be no Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act in Newfoundland and there would be no Wilderness Reserve in Baie du Nord or Avalon Peninsula Area if hunting was not allowed. Traditionally, in this province, we have been consumptive in a very local community way. People from the smallest to our largest communities are used to going into the country and hunting and fishing and I do not think that is going to change because the new generation of people out in the communities certainly still want to do the same thing. So, I think it was a function of our culture. It just had to be there.

Secondly, if you talk to the wildlife managers - and certainly we have listened to many of them over the years - they will tell you that you really cannot set up that area and have all those caribou, moose and other game species in there and expect to effectively manage if you could not allow to have some hunting. I think that is the general theory in wildlife management throughout the world, that you have to have regular hunting of species to allow for the sustainable development of those species over time, considering the range that they have which, incidentally, is always shrinking.

We have a big problem in Newfoundland now with road kills, moose running onto highways and things like that. It was mentioned last night in the bus that our Wildlife Division has given out another two to three thousand hunting permits to hunt moose and I think that is in recognition of the fact that, despite hunting and other types of consumptive activities which relate to that, such as road building, hydro, logging and the eating away of habitat, the populations are still increasing. And I think we are very fortunate that that is happening.

So, we would not have a reserve and we would not have an Act if we did not allow hunting. I do not think so.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Again, learning from Strathcona, Strathcona has been closed to the killing of wildlife since the beginning. You can kill fish, but you cannot kill things with fur, so you have no hunting, but you can mine, log and reservoir whatever you like, but, Bob, we have a few wolves that we can lend you.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Province of Nfld.): We have managed to extricate those from the island of Newfoundland.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): We have, obviously, in our own jurisdiction, run into the same kinds of problems when we set our first wilderness park up in Clearwater, which some of you are familiar with, a few years ago. One of the first applications for use that we received was from a river rafting company and, of course, some of the folks who were involved in planning and designating the area were aghast at the idea that we would allow what might look like a Labatt's commercial to occur in one of those beautiful rapids that we had taken all those wonderful photographs of.

Yet, on the other hand, by allowing a limited number in a very systematic sort of way, we could provide for canoeists as well as for rafters. We could, essentially, double the number of people who could see that park and speak for that park overnight. Yet, what is the advantage of doubling the number of people who come to us if it is supposed to be a wilderness area and every person who comes makes it less a wilderness? It is not a problem that I can solve, but it is just one of those things that we have to constantly fight and work with.

Bob, obviously, you made your solution based on how much you had to do to best manage the area and make sure you have the area. Maybe the lesson is, first of all, to make sure we have them and then, secondly, let us make sure that we are doing what needs to be done to keep them there.

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): I just wanted to pursue that last question with Bob. Do you allow commercial trapping?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): Yes.

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): Do you allow any mechanized trapping?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I am not certain of that. To tell you the truth, I would have to specifically look at the guidelines to see if we do. I know trapping is allowed and that includes commercial trapping. Now, if that includes mechanized trapping, then I guess it is allowed.

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): I think you are running into the same problem that we are running into with respect to your second objective when you use the word "undisturbed". We are all seeing that, but we are not really meeting that objective when we talk about these wilderness areas. You have been more restrictive, I guess, in your activities and uses in this park compared to what Jake has been presented with.

Jake talked about how important it was to continue to have the Parks Branch work closely with those client groups, especially the industries. You are in a position, especially with things like timber harvesting and mining, that, in the park, you really do not have them as a client group anymore. How do you see that compared to what Jake was saying, as far as our continued liaison from a Parks Branch point of view with client groups out there, given the way several of our different agencies are moving towards a peer approach of protecting parks?

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I can only answer that by going back to give you some insight into the history of the establishment of the Baie du Nord area, especially during the initial steps in the process when the proposal was sent around for interdepartmental review.

At that time, for instance, the mining companies and the Department of Mines and the forestry companies and the Department of Forestry indicated that there were commercial timber and commercial mineral possibilities in that area. If you remember the second map, which showed the larger, garage-sale-approach area, when that was whittled down to this size, it was necessary to exclude some areas because there was commercial timber and potential for mining. The mining companies and the departments involved agreed, at the time, that the new boundary was fine with them. So, in a sense, they backed out of the process at that time. They seemed to have been satisfied.

Now, if it comes to be that, over time, the Middle Ridge area is found to have a sizable, commercial development and that commercial extraction occurs, I think there is the possible danger of that happening here, from a mining perspective. Perhaps, there is more in here, maybe we should go in here. So, I think that could be a dangerous scenario that could develop over time. We have our fingers crossed that they will not find commercial properties in there and will not bother with them, in which case, it would become part of the Wilderness Reserve.

But to bring them back now into the picture and have them sit on an advisory council or a committee could be dangerous, in that they would then feel that they were brought back to the table and their interests looked at again.

CHAIRMAN: We will have one or two more questions and then we are going to wrap up here. I have several people with their hands up, but I believe Jim was first.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just have a comment. No matter what we do or say, we always run the risk that things are going to change. I am particularly relating to Jake's comments that some of the causes of the changes in Strathcona dealt with World War 1 and 2 and, who knows, there may be a 3 and a 4.

One of the things that I would like to draw a comparison to is our recent involvements in environmental assessment. We first got involved with that here in this province back in the early '70's, as much as probably the rest of Canada. One of our main beefs, at the time, was that we had the developers starting up and getting all their plans, their engineering drawings and everything all done before they got us, as environmental people, involved to make any sort of comment on it. And that always, as we say in Newfoundland, got our dander up and we sort of had a negative attitude, no matter what good might have come out of it.

I say that because I see some sort of a comparison here. We are now the developers in the sense that we are trying to promote sustainable areas or areas where we can sustain the environment - I do not like sustainable development - whether it is within Strathcona or the new Baie du Nord. The important lesson is to get the public - and that includes the client groups like mining or forestry - involved at the very early stages so that you can identify a lot of the problems that they, obviously, did not do in 1911 or before in Strathcona. That has a lot of potential for making it succeed a little better than it normally would.

When we talk about Baie du Nord, I always say that we have done more compromising than in 90% of the marriages in Canada in terms of getting things settled before we put the ring on the finger. We have a good contract drawn up and I think we have a situation where we have a much better chance of success with Baie du Nord than we do with anything else because we have the people involved and the public as well, so that, to the mining industry or to the forestry people, we can say and at least cause some delays in the future, "You had your chance, this is what you came out of it with, you have signed on the dotted line, now do not bug me anymore".

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): May I just make one comment? Jim compares that process to a marriage and I hope that marriage has many offspring.

CHAIRMAN: I had a couple of people with their hands up, Don and then Bill. If they are fairly short, we will take both of them.

MR. D. HUSTINS: Just to re-emphasize what Jim was saying, 12 years in the process of really setting aside the Baie du Nord has enabled us to work out those kinds of things with the mining and the forestry that you are talking about, in particular, what the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council has done. But I think the key to the whole thing that has happened here with the Baie du Nord is what Bob showed on one of the earlier slides, protected for us, not from us. When they finally saw, after our first round of twelve long days of one day in this community and another day in that community of public information sessions, that we were doing something to enable them to use the resource, as our forefathers had done for two to three hundred years, their fears were allayed.

We allowed them to have access to hunting. We allowed them to have access for boating. We allowed them to have access, even in most recent terms, for skidoos in certain areas. We were allowing them, in fact, to use their resource. That was the key component, that we were protecting it for them, not from them, and they saw the real challenge there in keeping hydro out and keeping forestry out because, if forestry had have gone in, they may not have had the moose populations or other things that might have happened otherwise in the immediate term. So, that is really the key, in some respect, of what has happened here.

If we had added the component that Norm was talking about now, bringing in those other people, I think we would be in great trouble if, all of a sudden, we brought forestry and mines on line. In terms of our Management Committee, I think we would be in big trouble because they are not, obviously, wanted at this point in time.

MR. W. WATKINS (Manitoba): I have had fun over the last few minutes just playing with the semantics of words, park, wilderness, ecological, and I think that the importance of the word you use can never be underestimated. I have neighbours in Winnipeg, new Canadians, whose idea of a park is slides, swing sets, maybe a spot of grass to play cricket on, and that is it.

With respect to wilderness, I think wilderness is very much a cultural term defined in the context of the culture in which it occurs. Certainly, in Canada, part of wilderness has been hunting and trapping forever. There are now estimates that there has been human habitation in North America for perhaps as long as 30,000 years. Hunting has occurred and trapping has occurred. In that sense, in preserving wilderness, you are preserving a heritage landscape and the cultural traditions that go along with it.

To preserve lands in the sense of maintaining functioning ecosystems, and biodiversity and all of that, I think the ecological reserve designation is probably the best one to use. Then you do not get wrapped up in all the cultural connotations. I do believe that, here in Newfoundland, you do have a separate category of ecological reserve which achieves those objectives.

CHAIRMAN: We have pretty well run to the end of our time. I think I am going to offer the two panelists the opportunity to make some concluding remarks and they may wish to respond, in the process, to some of those comments from the last couple of speakers.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): You have the same problems with ecological reserves, as a term, as to what you can and cannot do. It is one of the biggest problems that we have with our Cabinet, whether to use the word "reserve", "preserve", "park", "ecological reserve" or "wilderness. It means that you cannot log, mine or anything, folks. Multiple use is what it comes back to.

I wanted to make two observations, as we are going ahead, and I think that ties in, Alan, with the question that you had about where we go from here. What we want to do, learning from Strathcona, is to bring others to us. And you are right, we have the setting, the situation and the mind set that others now need to work with us. The public advocacy groups have done that for us and I think it has been tremendous. But just as we want them to sit at the table with us in a formal way so that, when we shape the master plan and our management approaches, it is understood, together with the press, the media.

At the same time, we are asking to do the converse of that. We want to be involved with the planning of the logging plants around the park. We want to be involved with Westmin and their plans and with Hydro and its plans. We want to influence those. So, it is a two-way street and I think that is what sustainable development is all about. You invite them in to help with where you are going and you expect and demand an invitation back to shape where they are going, so that you work together.

There is another thing that I wanted to point out that has sort of occurred to me. We have all been in this whole business of marketing and trying to drive up numbers of users into the facilities that we have in place and we have marketing strategies. If you look at marketing, it takes an amount of effort to get a public perception of what it is you are offering that people are attracted to come and use and enjoy. The minute you let up on maintaining that image, it noses down and, in a competitive world, you may not be able to bring it back without a lot of effort.

I am thinking about a situation, particularly in B.C., where we have Barkerville Historic Park. When that was being built, it was in the media, it was being written up and used to skyrocket it. Then nobody did anything about marketing and the use dropped down and it is going to take a great deal of effort to return public interest to that.

I think the same principles apply to preservation. We need to develop a systematic strategy of getting things in the media to retain public attention and support and awareness in exactly the same way. And it needs to be done consciously.

Where we are at in B.C. - and that is why I look at things quite positively with regard to privatization - is we have divested our staff now of being overly concerned about whether toilets are clean and whether we hire people to run toilets. We now contract that out and the terms, the specifications and the standards that we want maintained are clear. We examine them and either they met them or not. It is the contractor's responsibility to see that in place.

Our district managers are no longer operational managers; they have become resource managers. So, within the organization, quite a change is taking place where we are saying to our district manager that, whereas before they were supposed to operate the facilities, now they manage the park. They are the parks managers in their districts in all respects, meeting the locals VPs, the union, the mayors, the local MLAs. So, you have to sort of look at things in a much broader context, but I think we are in a very healthy environment, developmental wise. I am really excited about where things are going and it is not doom and gloom. There are some really exciting developments taking place across the country and across the world.

MR. B. HALFYARD (Newfoundland and Labrador): I will wax poetic to finish off and all I will say is that wilderness is a state of mind painted onto nature's canvas. So, think about that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to, on your behalf, thank the speakers who have put together excellent presentations and participated in the workshop and thank you, as well, for actively participating. I think it has been a very worthwhile. Thank you.

JULY 19TH, 1990

AFTERNOON SESSION

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS

OPEN DISCUSSION

MR. D. HUSTINS (Director of Parks, Department of Environment and Lands, Nerwfoundland and Labrador)(Chairman): Welcome back to the final proceedings of the conference. What we have scheduled now for this afternoon are the three moderators who were involved in moderating each of the workshops. They are prepared to give you a five or ten-minute summary, observations, and any of the highlights of the discussions. Following that, we are going to have a question period for whatever length of time we require with them, and then we will get into the closing remarks for the whole conference.

So, first, I would call upon Ian Rutherford, from the Canadian Parks Service, to give us a summary of the workshop that he moderated.

SUMMARY BY MR. IAN RUTHERFORD

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Director General, National Parks, Canadian Park Service): I will preface my remarks by saying simply that this will not be a long summary. I did work over the lunch hour to produce it, but the total amount of time available to do that over lunch hour was approximately 20 seconds. It is going to be very ad hoc an disjointed.

I am talking now about the Workshop on Parks Systems Planning and Sustainable Development where we had three excellent speakers who each brought a different point of view to the question. We had the perspective from the point of view of someone associated with the non-professional community, a global and national point of view, and some very pointed challenges to us as the Federal-Provincial Parks Council on how to deal with the question of parks systems planning.

We had, as well, an explanation of how parks systems planning has proceeded in the jurisdiction, namely Ontario, where the systems planning apparatus is well developed, longstanding and quite complicated and multifaceted, but also very useful. Finally, and I am not giving these in the order of the presentations that were made, we had a presentation from a representative of an independent organization that is helping the province of Newfoundland, which is new in the game, to devise a systems plan for their use. They were all excellent presentations and they all made points which I can draw on in my summary.

The underlying aim of the workshop was to try to get some discussion of issues which could be used to contribute to our effort to come up with a list of principles which this body could put forward to Ministers to buy into. Each of the speakers addressed that question and gave us ideas which can be incorporated and which we have already incorporated into our draft statement of principles over the lunch hour.

I am not going to read out the draft statement of principles unless you want me to. The Directors were at that meeting and they have not been finalized yet, so I am not sure I want to get into a detailed discussion of a wording again in a group as big as this. Suffice it to say that we did come up with a list of, I think, in the end, seven principles which cover most of the points that we started out with and include additional points which were drawn from the workshop. I will say a few words about those in a minute.

The other useful information, from my point of view, which came out of the workshop was a number of ideas on what succeeds as those things that help get on with the job of systems planning and also some good discussion of hindrances to getting on with that job.

First of all, I want to mention that several speakers brought up the point that parks systems planning is only part of a larger picture; there is a bigger framework. There is the whole question of land-use planning in general and, in many provinces and territories, this is well advanced and governments are grappling with trying to put together a systematic framework of how the resources of the province and how the land of the province or territory should be used.

And the important point there is - and this was made by several speakers - that protection of some part of that land base is a legitimate option and it should be on the table, it should be part of the overall, land-use, planning process and that fits in, of course, very well, with our own parks systems planning ideas.

But we have to recognize that we cannot plan parks systems in a vacuum and that there are other people out there who have other ideas of what that land could be used for. The only way we can resolve those conflicts is not by proceeding independently with our own pet ideas, but by working through dialogue with the other advocates to come up with an overall plan.

In some cases, we are ahead of the pack, but, in other cases, we are behind. In some cases, land-use planning has been carried out by default and large tracts of land have been let out on the assumption that there really was not much use for them, let out to particular interests on an exclusive basis. I think jurisdictions are beginning to realize that that is not the best way to proceed and that we have to take a look at a rational use of all of our resources. The important thing for us, as park agencies, is to get into that game, if we are not in it already, because, if we do not, we are going to be left out.

The second point on what helps or what leads to success is the key importance of political support. We are talking here about matters which affect the entire population, the welfare and well-being of people, and the best way for those matters to be expressed is at the political level and so good political support is needed, particularly on the part of the key Ministers. In our case the Minister responsible for Parks is very, very important. If those key people are not behind us, we are not going to succeed. Of course, that is what we are talking about in trying to put a statement of principles before our Parks Ministers because we are trying to make sure that they understand what we are up to and that they can buy into it.

Secondly, we need public support. The support of the population at large is critical because politicians, of course, are very sensitive to that and, in general, follow it. One of the key points is that park advocates are key players on our side of that debate and, in many cases, they have played a key role in garnering public support, both at large and in the smaller sense, in the sense of specific proposals. Specific proposals never succeed without local support.

There was a time in the past when parks were established without local support. Canadian Parks Service has been involved in a number of those and has resolved to never do it again. We do not like scenes analagous to the kind of scenes we have been seeing on television lately with regard to the golf course in Oka. A number of members of CPS have commented that those scenes reminded them very much of what happened in the case of establishment of some of our national parks. So, we have learned the hard way and I think we are working very hard now to recognize that public support is a critical component. That, of course, is important, not only to us, but to the whole, land-use, planning process.

Someone mentioned that another key component is the dedication of our own staff and I think we are all lucky in that regard. We have good dedicated people who understand what is important and who know how to get the job done. It is also key, though, to have a little bit of help from our friends, so, in staff, I include not just our own staff, but I include the kind of excellent collaborators that are exemplified by the group that is helping Newfoundland in its systems planning.

We had a good deal of discussion about those things that may help or may hinder, depending on how you look at them. We talked about the setting of explicit targets and the setting of standards for completion. I think there was general agreement that those things which, on initial examination, tend to make people nervous, at least in some sectors, are beneficial.

When we are dealing with the organized proponents of alternative land uses, it helps to have an explicit target because then they have something they can grasp. They know that we are not making open-ended demands, that we have scheme, we have a system, we know where we are going, we know what we want - and it is not the world - and they can understand that. They have plans for using these areas as well and, if we state clearly what it is we want, we can usually reach accommodation with those who are also capable of stating clearly what they want. And it encourages them to make those statements. So, on balance, it was agreed that the setting of targets, be they of kind or of nature or temporal ones, are useful.

In at least one of the sessions, we had a bit of debate about the validity or usefulness or not of things like the famous 12%. I think my previous remarks apply and we agreed that such a target is useful if only to explain to those who ask the question, "How much do you really want?" Then we can say, "Well, it is only so much".

We also agreed, though, that it is not the kind of figure that you can blindly apply to every situation. It does not apply, for example, to every natural region. It does not apply, necessarily, to every province. It may be a useful guide, when the day is done and when we have completed other more important targets, such as representational targets, as to whether or not we are in the right ballpark. So, on that level, I think we all agreed that something like the 12% is useful.

The downside of it, of course, is that one can become too fixated on numbers and neglect other things that are perhaps more important. It would be very tempting, for example, to set aside all of the Northwest Territories and say, "There we are, 30%, we have it", but that would not accomplish what we are trying to accomplish.

We also had some discussion about whether or not, once we have a systems plan, we are finished. Is that the goal? Or should we not perhaps be doing periodic reviews? And in drawing them up, should we not perhaps be looking at the state of the overall environment, not just the pure kind of bio-geophysical inventory kind of thing, but what is its overall state? What are the threats to it? And what is the health of our current protected areas?

We all agreed that, indeed, we should be looking at those things, but the latter things form part of the background to developing systems plans and I think we have some mechanisms in place in terms of the State of the Parks Reports and State of the Environment Reports, at least at the federal level, and one of those includes information on other jurisdictions which can help in that regard, and I think we should keep that point in mind.

On the question of periodic reviews, clearly, we do have to do that. In fact, that is part of what we are doing here. One of our principles, which we agreed to over the lunch hour, was that we all have separate systems plans or will have or should have, but we cannot draw those up in a vacuum and we have to look at what other people are doing who are playing the same game in adjacent or complementary jurisdictions, and that means we have to review them, just for that reason.

We should be reviewing them with time, as well, because ecological systems are not static. We have things happening like climate change, which is not going to happen overnight, but it is going to happen on a scale of decades, so we are told. So, clearly, periodic review of systems plans is an important thing and many jurisdictions have built in a review and a reporting process, in particular my own, as a result of legislation which says that we must do that. So, that is a good thing.

We did have some discussion, which I would like to reflect on, on how to deal with the question of local opposition to park establishment because that really is the key to being able to move forward. Systems plans are meaningless if you cannot implement them and, if you cannot implement them because of local opposition, then you are buffaloed. We had some good words on how to do that. Clearly, it cannot be done on a technical level; talking about biogeographical regions and 12% and all of that does not cut much ice with someone who sees his freedom being constrained or his economic opportunities being constrained.

We did have some discussion on how we should appeal to cultural arguments and how we should make it clear that local people do have a say in specific site selection, in drawing up boundaries and in discussing trade-offs. That is something that we are very much into in the Canadian Parks Service, so it struck a note with me. The idea of demonstration projects and park reserves and even working with other parts of government to defuse some of the opposition which is directed against government in general against things for which we are not responsible can be helpful.

So, those are the ideas that I drew from the workshop and I am sorry it is somewhat disjointed. I am sure I have missed many points, so some of the speakers and commentators may wish to add to what I have said and I will leave it at that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ian. Instead of opening questions at this point in time, we are going to continue with the other moderators. And I will now call on Gordon Prouse who moderated the workshop on Sustainable Development. Gordon.

SUMMARY BY MR. GORDON PROUSE

MR. G. PROUSE (Director of Parks, Manitoba): Thanks, Don. The title of our workshop was Parks Role and Participation in Sustainable Development. The panel addressed things in a very organized fashion. It certainly was not planned that way, but it worked out extremely well because we moved from some broad concepts to some very specific applications and it flowed very, very well.

The objective of the workshop was to test the principles that we have been working on, as a Council, and that we are going to be presenting to the Ministers. We had some different perspectives presented, but it did, in fact, serve to test the principles that we have been working on.

The two workshops actually focused on two different aspects regarding parks. One fleshed out, expanding our view of parks contribution to the economic side of things and the other addressed parks role from the scientific research perspective, so we had two completely different workshops in a sense.

Now, I have a tendency to be a bit of a clumper rather than a splitter, so I am simply going to try to combine some of the salient points and add a bit of my own interpretation to what actually went on. So, you probably will not recognize anything that was said during these workshops.

One of the key words that came out of the workshop was flexibility. Each jurisdiction, through their respective roundtables on the environment and economy, should have the flexibility to adopt their own interpretation of the definition of sustainable development. This permits the flexibility for each jurisdiction to target specific challenges in integrating the environment in the economy. In a sense, the country will end up with a family of definitions that are tailored to their own jurisdictional needs. And I think that is very important.

Now, parks should be a part of that strategy. Although we have to permit a broad interpretation of sustainable development, it is essential to have both environmental and economic ingredients addressed to be considered a sustainable development thrust. So, integration is another key word. It has to be there.

It follows then that, in defining the roles of parks in sustainable development, we too must flesh out both the economic and the environmental ingredients. So, when we are talking about protected lands, we have to interpret in some fashion the economic implications and how that integrates with the environmental component. Now, that interpretation can either be one that restrains economic development or it may, in fact, be one that enhances economic development, but to be sure, we have to touch upon the economic side of things.

So, parks role must be seen as being an integrated component, not one that has a unique place and stands aside of the sustainable development process. We cannot be seen as being that special that we are not part of the process. We must do a better job of developing partnerships so that we are viewed as part of a team.

In terms of protected areas, we will play the lead role, but we are not the only game in town and we have to recognize that and acknowledge the other participants.

Parks is in the unique position, through its interpretive programming, to quickly become active in an information-education program and target sustainable development activities. And we are probably unique in that situation.

To realize the benefits of sustainable development, people must understand it in order to get them on side. Parks must be protected for people rather than against people, and I think people have to understand that. It is critical that more scientific research be conducted within parks so that we better understand the ecological processes that maintain biological diversity. Parks then will be in a position as truly serving as benchmarks. It was really stressed during the workshops that we do not understand what we have protected and, therefore, we are not sure what is normal and what is abnormal. If we are going to serve as benchmarks, we have to know and, to do that, more scientific research is required.

Parks must develop cooperative working relationships with universities to conduct needed research - and I stress needed research - as there was some discussion on what is needed and what is not. Communication is seen as more of a challenge to the research than actually obtaining financing for research. So, again, it is building partnerships and improving our communications.

The role of a specific park in contributing to sustainable development should be articulated in its respective management plan. In other words, when we are doing a management plan or interim management guidelines or whatever we might call it, the research activities should be identified as a component of that plan and agreed upon.

The interpretive program would convey any sustainable development activities and the integration of the environment and the economy would be identified within that particular park. So, we see a system that allows the strategic component of sustainable development within parks being identified through the various roundtables and adopted through those roundtables and then we actually see the practical application of sustainable development as it is identified through a management plan.

Now, as Ian mentioned earlier, the role of the public in this whole exercise is extremely important and we stressed that public participation has to be a key component. In most of our activities, the public is involved in management-plan development.

Now, in terms of the workshops meeting the objectives, I feel very comfortable that, very clearly, the principles that we had fleshed out for the Ministers stood the test of the workshop. None of those principles were challenged enough to have to be modified. What we did get out of the workshop is that we are better able to describe what we mean by those principles and I think that was significant accomplishment.

Also, the principles that we are talking about advancing to the Ministers with respect to sustainable development complement the principles that we are talking about respecting protected areas in systems plan development. They are on a slightly different level, but they are complementary and I think that is a significant achievement.

And that is it, thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Gord. I would now like to call on Barry Diamond, who moderated the two case studies, the one on Strathcona and the Baie du Nord. Barry.

MR. B. DIAMOND (Director of Parks and Recreation, Department of ALands and Forests, Parks Division, Nova Scotia): Thank you, Don. The third workshop was intended to look at the Role of Parks in Sustainable Development by examining two well presented case studies by Bob Halfyard and Jake Masselink.

We tended not to be particularly philosophical in this workshop, but tended to look in a fairly pragmatic way, I guess, at parks and perhaps focus more on mechanisms for establishing parks and maintaining them as protected areas rather than defining the role. Although Bob Halfyard did, very carefully, take us through, in his presentation, the relationship between what was being down with the planning for the Baie du Nord Wilderness Area, and the principles of sustainable development.

I do not want to presume, in summarizing here, to take from these case studies the lessons that all people who participated would learn from the case studies; I think that is very much an individual matter. I would like to, perhaps, identify a few observations that I made and I am sure others will have different thoughts.

We began by referencing the Brundtland Commission Report which supports and reinforces the role of parks in contributing to sustainable development through protection of land and resources, but which warns against an approach to parks establishment in isolation from greater society. The relevance of that warning was evident from the presentations.

Bob Halfyard presented a case study on the Baie du Nord Wilderness Reserve which has been in existence for only 123 days. By contrast, Jake walked us through the history of Strathcona Park, which is the oldest in B.C. and which extends back over nearly 80 years. There were some dramatic differences and, yet, there were some similarities in what was being said.

Both parks are intended to play a role in the protection of significant natural resources, but Strathcona has been compromised by a long history of resource extraction and development, despite having been initially set aside for preservation purposes.

The Baie du Nord, on the other hand, is a relatively pristine area, but one which, in the eyes of some, has been compromised because of the hunting and trapping which is permitted within its boundaries.

In establishing the Baie du Nord, the Newfoundland government consulted with the communities, with environmental interest groups and with commercial and economic interests of the province. They received a very clear message from the people of Newfoundland that they should protect the area for the people and not from the people.

Based on this concept, they were able to arrive at a decision to set aside a large area which is protected from development and from most resource extraction, but, to gain agreement for that protection, they had to respect the traditional cultural values and practices of Newfoundlanders by allowing hunting and trapping to continue on a sustainable basis. Despite some debate and discomfort over this compromise, it was noted by one participant that the critical matter is to set aside the land because, unless you can do that, you have made no progress toward the establishment of protected areas.

It was also observed that this was an analagous to a good marriage because the contract had been carefully negotiated and it was expected to last.

So, I think there are perhaps a couple of lessons that can be learned from this: One is to identify clearly the most important objective that you have to achieve and, clearly, the setting aside of protected areas is high on the list. Secondly, you must negotiate the best possible contract and then manage for the highest level of protection possible in order to achieve your system of protected areas.

From the B.C. example, on the other hand, we have seen the price of compromise. Strathcona Park has been a lamb which was sacrificed for mining, forestry, hydro and other interests. Having come full circle, they are now looking to find a way to return to the original protection mandate. But, like a wary fighter who has gained experience the hard way, they have to find ways to meet their opponent without re-entering the ring.

In this regard, they now see, not only the companies, but also environmental interest groups as partners with whom they need to work. As Jake pointed out, you cannot rely on legislative protection alone - and I think there is a lesson for all of us to learn there - nor can they rely on interest groups alone to protect the parks.

He pointed out that we must involve all of the stakeholders on an ongoing basis and that there is a need to continually ensure that parks and park values are before the public. Also, he pointed out the need to be involved in what goes on beyond park boundaries because of the impact of these interests and needs that exist for communities, etc. beyond the park boundaries, and that this has a significant impact on the parks.

Newfoundland as well recognizes the need for consultation and they have organized an ongoing process involving committees and workshops. So, both emphasize the need for ongoing consultation and advocacy among the public.

In summarizing then, briefly, some of the lessons, I guess one thought that I would have on it is that there was an obvious need to fit the solutions to the situations that we find ourselves in within our particular jurisdictions. Obviously, the situation in B.C. and the situation in Newfoundland are quite different and require different solutions.

We need to be imaginative and flexible in order to succeed, given these particular circumstances that we all face. We need to be vigilant with respect to changes and threats to our parks and protected areas aAnd we need to be responsive to change and to predict and get ahead of change to the extent that that is possible. Above all, we must remain relevant to the public and cultivate a relationship with the broad public through education, outreach and whatever means are at our disposal in order to achieve that.

So, very briefly that is my summary in a nutshell.

OPEN DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Barry. Now, you have an opportunity to raise any particular questions you may have to the panelists and moderators who took charge of those sessions this morning. So, I will open the floor for any discussion or comments.

Norm Richards.

MR. N. RICHARDS (Ontario): I just want to follow up what Barry has just said. We discussed this a little bit before, this building that constituency behind the parks program out there. I am really wondering, as a group, if we are being as progressive and proactive as we should be and that is why I ask Jake the following question.

After everything you have been through in Strathcona - and it is a great case study of all the things that can happen - did we really learn that much and would we have done anything differently? I guess the point I was getting at is, if we had the chance to do that over again, were there times when, as a parks branch and as the people who are looked upon as being the park advocates across this nation, were we too weak? Did we not take advantage more of really being strong advocates ourselves as Parks Directors?

I know it is a question I am always asking myself. I know we all work within different Ministries or Departments of Environment and we know that the politicians are eternally looking for the ultimate compromise. Again, this afternoon, in your summaries, we are all talking about more flexibility and more compromise.

But we are the park advocates. If somebody is out there not really leading the way, we may lose even more ground. I know we are always trying to find a happy medium. Are there any other things that people are doing or trying to do? I know that we are all preparing strategies and trying to be more proactive, but I think, sometimes, maybe we are being weak and we should be stronger.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): I do not know that I have any particular answer to that, Norm, but maybe some others have comments or thoughts on it. I guess the way I would respond is that perhaps there is more that we should, as parks managers and administrators, be doing. I think, though, it is very important to look at all of the tools and mechanisms that we have at our disposal and that involves everything from using the media interacting with the public and using advisory committees working with interest groups. I think it involves all of those kinds of things and also being as strong and outspoken as we can be, given the framework that we work within as public servants. But there may be other people who have more to say about that.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): I have one thought on that that I might contribute. It seems to me that this illustrates the importance of parks systems planning because, if we are talking about a park that was established, perhaps originally, for protection purposes, but not on a very solid basis, the door is always open for someone to talk about alternative uses. If it was not planned from the beginning as a place that had some imperatives to be set aside, if it was originally set aside because it was just a lump in the middle of a big wilderness and it was convenient to set it aside, of course, people are going to come along and say, "That is just a wilderness area like any other, you can adjust the boundary. You can find another one just as nice somewhere else".

That is why I think it is so important to be able to say, from the outset, that this is the area that represents whatever it is you want to represent. Its boundaries were chosen with care, compromises and adjustments were worked out in the beginning and that is it, folks. Unless the situation has changed, those imperatives are still there and we, at least, have a strong argument to counter those who would change the boundaries and set it up for alternative use.

So, that is one thing I think that can help.

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): As a Director, I would like to perhaps take exception to being considered as a park advocate. I do not think that term appears in any job description either. I think that we should look at ourselves as either parks administrators or parks managers and, within that context, we should ensure that the processes, that Ian has outlined, are in place such that we are able to manage those kinds of situations when they arise. But I am not sure that we can play the role as a park advocate.

CHAIRMAN: It is, obviously, a very delicate role. Whether an advocate or not, we are probably in there on a daily basis, whether we realize it or not, interacting, I suppose, with our politicians and people on the street. That is an interesting observation, nevertheless. Are there any further comments?

MR. A. HACKMAN (World Wildlife Fund): I have a couple of things. I would like to end with just pursuing Gord's point a little bit because I think it is a really relevant one at this juncture in the history of FPPC.

First of all, the subject of the meeting is very timely. As I tried to say in my remarks, I think we are at a very pivotal point in terms of what horse we ride out of this meeting and into the sustainable development discussion nationally. I think there is tremendous opportunity and ground to be gained by joining in the sustainable development discussion by making sure we have a seat at that table in whatever forms it takes us in pursuing the parks case. We have a lot to lose if we do not.

The risks, of course, of joining the discussion are very much the risks of losing the distinctive quality of the land designations that we all pursue. I just want to follow up here on the point that Gordon was making earlier about having to deal with both the scientific and the economic sides of the sustainable development value of parks. In pursuing the economic side and in speaking to the economic benefits and issues, it is important that we make it very clear, as a fundamental prerequisite or a cardinal rule, that protection itself is a contribution and that natural ecosystems themselves have direct economic value that should not be measured or confined to measures of income, but be viewed much more broadly.

So, I toss the suggestion out about someone at FPPC or whoever might just do some experimental calculations to try to pin down what I think would be interesting numbers on the economic contribution that protected areas can make over and above tourism income or some other form of job-related, economic benefits. I think it is absolutely essential that we hang on to the principle that protection itself is a contribution to sustainable development.

Secondly, I wanted to emphasize what is really a nuance, perhaps, but I think a strategic point, again. In terms of what WWF and other organizations are pursuing with respect to the endangered spaces campaign, I think it is important to emphasize that the goal that is being talked about there is not, specifically, the completion of parks systems by the year 2000, rather it is the completion of a network of ecologically representative protected areas.

Now, anyone outside of this room would probably say: What on earth has that fellow just said? What is a distinction? What kind of hairs is he splitting? To me, it is a very important strategic distinction in terms of what roles Parks Directors and Ministers play.

First of all, it means that achieving that conservation goal does not only put responsibility in the backs of Parks Ministers. Many agencies contribute and many designations contribute. It is not just a parks game we are talking about. At the same time, I think that reality gives Parks Ministers a real need and boost in going to speak to roundtables or participating in roundtables and putting this goal on the table.

It is not as though Parks Ministers are faced with having to go to a roundtable and say that completing protected area systems or doing the conservation job in this jurisdiction means that they have to finish their parks systems. It means that we, collectively, need to finish this system of protected areas and we will do our part in our Ministries to contribute to that. But it is really a shared objective that this jurisdiction has to undertake.

So, I think it is really an important strategic distinction. Of course, at the same time, it gives local flexibility in terms of what designations can work to achieve ecological representation. The other side of that point is merely the need to emphasize that it is really that ecological representation goal that is urgent. If we lose this opportunity to achieve that goal, we do not get a second chance.

There are lots of other pieces to the conservation puzzle that need to be filled in. This one has a particular time line, I think, and I hope that that message would come through in the Directors and Deputies briefings of Ministers prior to the meeting in September because I think that is really fundamental.

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): Just to follow up on that point a little bit, I agree with what you are saying, Arlin, but, sometimes, that kind of global argument on the value of protected areas does not help when you are dealing with a specific situation. If it is the last represented area in that natural region, then you can argue that we should not touch it, but, if there is an alternative and you have not identified, early in the game, that this is the one that has to be saved for this, that and the other reason, and be able to put those arguments on the table against the arguments of all the others, then you are going to fail because someone will say, "Oh, you can get your representation somewhere else; you just move down the road".

Now, that may well, in fact, be alright and maybe moving parks that march away from the mining development on one side is not too bad, but we need to understand. The problem is often that we are not sure. We are not sure what ecology we are protecting or whether we have it and whether we can contemplate whether such a move makes it better or worse. And that is our problem. That is why I really liked the comments from one of the workshops that we really have to know. We have to be working from a knowledge base, not just from an emotional base.

But that brings me to the point that Gordon raised. I think, in contrast to him, that it is important for park managers to be more than just administrators. It does not do the parks business any good to leave parks in the hands of bloodless bureaucrats. I think that it is good that parks managers can take sides, can state clearly where they stand and defend those stands. If I did not believe that, I do not think I would be in the business, and I think many of you are the same. In fact, I think that is one of the interesting things about the parks business. The people in it, by and large, believe in what they are doing, they are doing it for a reason and that makes it special.

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): I just have a comment with respect to trying to get a group of Ministers on side. We also have to recognize that the Ministers are not elected by the people of Canada, but rather by the people in their respective jurisdictions and they have a great deal of concern over that.

With respect to time frames, I think that everyone agrees that there should be a target, but, whether or not we can have a universal target, I think is something that is unrealistic. So, again, we have to leave it to the respective jurisdictions to sort out that particular timing.

We may well see that other factors apply and I will use the example of the Manitoba roundtable, which is made up of some very influential people on both sides and they have a working arrangement. If something appears that upsets that working arrangement, then I think we could see some difficulties in the roundtable functioning and I do not think anyone at this point in time would like that to occur. So, it is a matter more of timing than an unwillingness to set targets.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): I had a question framed and then Ian used the phrase that made me think of another one to which I will not ask you for an answer, Ian, but I think that there has to be something in the spectrum between bloodless bureaucrats and bloody politicians that will get all of this sorted out. Maybe that is what we are really after here. Just a joke, Mr. Minister, sir.

I do not want to be negative, actually, but, when we come to these sessions, we often get so involved in what we are discussing and forget that we are going to have to go back and do something realistic with it. Sometimes, you wonder, when you get your head immersed in a concept like sustainable development and when you make your way through the workshops that we have been particpating in for the last few days, if it is not simply a matter of the converted preaching to the converted. You wonder whether the message that we have received and the kinds of challenges that we are looking at are things that we can make real and take back to our own workshops, our own jurisdictions and our own bloody politicians and get something done about them. I had better stop using that phrase.

I guess what I am wondering is whether each of the moderators of the workshop groups would be willing to just briefly indicate to us what they think, from the perspective of their particular group, is the one, most important, first thing that each of us should think about doing when we leave this conference to see what we can do about sustainable development vis-à-vis parks.

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): With respect to sustainable development, I think each of us could go back immediately - we all have access to an interpretive program - and ensure that they start working in sustainable development themes within those particular interpretive programs.

For those of us who have management plans who are working on interim management guidelines, I think it is just a matter of sitting down and starting to think about what we are doing within the context of those plans and how that actually applies to sustainable development. So, I think you could do something immediately with respect to getting information out and starting to build up a constituency for sustainable development. I do not think you need any approval from anyone, to start with, it is just a matter of making a slight shift, thinking about it differently and getting going on it. So, if we want action immediately within sustainable development, I think you could do that.

A little bit later down the road, we hope that we are going to have ministerial support for integrating things into the strategies of the various roundtables. I think some of that is out of our hands, but the other part of it is not, so we can start educating people right away.

MR. A. APPLEBY (Saskatchewan): When you ask a question like that, I think of three things to come out of this whole conference, three common themes: (1) the expansion of parks systems and protected areas as part of sustainable development, (2) the expansion of the scientific base of how we do our business and (3) the educational link. All three of these things are, in fact, the three key components of the parks and protected areas part of the Green Plan, so what I find here is simply reinforcement for what I know we are doing or trying to do and some confirmation that we are on the right track, and it just renews my resolve to stay on that track.

MR. B. DIAMOND (Nova Scotia): It is a good question. What do you go back and do as a result of the kinds of things that we have talked about here? The other speakers have identified some interesting reactions. Thinking about it in our particular context, perhaps the most important thing that I can see as a priority over the next while is to ensure that our particular Minister is briefed on what has gone on at this conference and is prepared for the meeting that will come up in September.

Not only does that have value in terms of the participation of our Minister and our province in that, but also in terms of, perhaps, helping to remove some of the problems and obstacles that relate to resources and funding that would help us to deal with some of the things that Ian, for example, has identified, expansion of the system, dealing with the scientific base and improving the linkages in an educational sense, so I think that is where I would place my priority initially.

MR. E. LIGHT: This is somewhat directed to Ian. You make reference to systematically selecting areas through park boundaries or the like. Is it possible to have a systematic selection of park areas with the political arena that we work in?

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): The answer is no, not totally, but what I would argue is that we should try to do that, carry that as far as we can and then make the compromises at the beginning. I would be the first to admit that compromises and other considerations have to be made and I would be the first to admit that not all parks are established for ecological reasons, but, where they are, we should know that, we should know why, we should know what compromises we are making and we should be prepared to defend it. We play in the political arena like everybody else and, if we can make good compromises that satisfy our objectives, then we should be happy. That is the best we can hope for, but we should know what those objectives are.

MR. G. PROUSE (Manitoba): I just have an additional comment, in part with respect to Ed, but also the advocacy business. During a Directors' Meeting, we tabled a document about resource extraction activities across Canada's parks systems. It is interesting to note that, on one end of the scale, is Manitoba which has the more traditional, multiple-use approach to parks management and, on the other end of the scale, is National Parks which is certainly keyed towards a more protection-conservation type of management regime. So, Ian and I often have some differing perspectives on how some things operate and it is interesting how you are influenced by the environment that you operate as to how you see it functioning.

One of the benefits, I think, is that it is really healthy for us to look across the country and to interact with our colleagues across the country so that we moderate, sometimes, our positions and perhaps are able to present a holistic point of view to our perspective Ministers. I think it is very, very healthy.

MS. H. GRIFFIN: My background is in environmental education and I also work with a membership organization of interpreters. I would just like to follow up on Gordon's comments about going back to parks systems and establishing more in the way of sustainable development content and interpretive programs. The interpretive field and the educational field, through parks, has to play a far more important role than that because you run into the same problem of preaching to the converted if you are talking about just developing an interpretive programming within the boundaries of the parks.

I think it is important that there be - and we talked about this yesterday - partnerships formed with schools and other outside organizations that can help to build more public support for protected areas and for parks in general. I do not think you should underestimate the potential for changing, particularly young people's, attitudes toward protected areas and towards the general field of conservation. The times are definitely different than when Strathcona Park was established some 80 years ago. Now, you really can draw on public support and draw on public societal attitudes that put the environment really very, very much in the foreground in terms of priority.

So, I really think that parks have to play an important role in extension education and interpretive work, generally, in the field of conservation.

MR. I. RUTHERFORD (Canada): I would like to pick up on that because that strikes a very strong chord as well.

I think that is another reason why we need to know about our parks. If we have scientific results about what our parks mean and are and if they are published in the public domain, they will get into the educational mainstream, they will be used and people will learn, from kneehigh up, what it is that parks are important for.

Another component of that is something that we are just beginning to become involved in, i.e. interactions with other educational institutions to explain parks stories as well as broader environmental messages, but illustrating broader environmental messages through park-specific stories. In the marine park area, where we have only one and a half marine parks and fractions of others, they are going to be difficult to explain to people. Unless you are a diver or a marine biologist, it is going to be hard to grasp what they are all about.

But there is a wonderful opportunity to explain what they are all about in aquaria. We have started building relationships with the Vancouver Aquarium and there are aquaria getting established all over this continent. In fact, all over the world, there is a boom in the aquarium business, for some reason. There is one being talked about for Ottawa and they are at the building-design stage. There is another one for Toronto. There is one going into the old Veledrome in Montreal. There is one being promoted for Halifax. And who knows what else? And those are marvelous places to talk about marine areas, in general, and marine park areas, in particular.

To some extent, museums play a similar role for some aspects of our land parks. The Burgess Shales, for example, in Yoho National Park are an international story. The best examples of the fossils from that place are in the Smithsonian Institute in Washington and, to some extent, in the Royal Ontario Museum. We have a few on site. But we reach a far larger public in an educational sense through those remote locations and through books like Stephen J. Gould's book. So, I think what you are saying is very important. There is a broader, educational community with which we have to interact and be a full player.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any further comments? Perhaps this is a good way, on that positive remark about interpretive education, to wrap up this particular session.

That being the case, let us move on to another item. I call on Jake Masselink to come up and introduce British Columbia's plans for the 1991 Conference in that province.

By the way, this is the 31st annual conference we are having next year and the 30th anniversary.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

1991 FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL PARKS CONFERENCE

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Before I tell you what we are about for next year, which is in that package there, I would like Don to explain the business about moose in Newfoundland because I believe you have Park Interpretation Week next week. Come up here and explain to me about this moose. Did you adopt the moose or what?

CHAIRMAN: What Jake is referring to, I guess, is the Annual Park Interpretation Week that we have had, something like Saskatchewan, for over 10 years. What we are getting into this year is the theme, in terms of education, Introduced Species in the Province. We have chosen to discuss the interactions of introduced species in this province - and the moose was introduced here at the turn of the previous century - and indicate the consequences of introducing those species and the ramifications in terms of road accidents and the damage they do with the forest industry as well as the economic contribution, I guess, the moose have made with regard to the hunting industry in the province.

So, what you are looking at - I do not know if that is what you understood it to be - is really an elaboration on the theme of Introduced Species in the Province, among other things.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): The question I was going to then ask you is whether you have all your interpreters dressed up like moose?

CHAIRMAN: I can see what is coming now. No, they are not dressed up like moose, but I believe you have some sort of moose symbol or something out in B.C., probably even here today.

MR. J. MASSELINK (British Columbia): Well, that is to bad because our budgets are short, but we had planned to have our Gerry the Moose here to meet yours to see if they still looked alike. But, since that is not the case, we will give you a picture. Now, Gerry comes on contract with us in every park and you can hang that one up in your office.

Anyway, for next year, we thought it would be a good sequel to this year's theme, Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development, to have the follow-up theme that we sort have been touching on, Fostering Participatory Stewardship, the theme for next year. We selected Campbell River, not because of the cohoe fishing out there, but because it was sort of the center or the focus of a lot of what has shaped our thinking, as well as that of our politicians. What we have in mind is to invite others to this conference, perhaps people from industry, native leaders, conservation groups, other agencies and elected officials. We will see what we can pull together.

The Conference next year will be back to back with the Canadian Ecological Reserves Conference and it is going to be the week after that of the Association of State Park Directors in Oregon. You can see that we are kind of staging things a little bit to market this whole thing and we hope that people do not get conferenced out by the time they arrive in B.C.

I have given you each a package and there are more if you have others that you want to invite. We have been given approval by the Council, in principle, for this title and, by January, we will come back with more detailed specifics of what we hope to put on. So, with that, I would like to invite all of you to next year's conference in B.C. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Jake. I was wondering what he was getting up to there, for a minute, with that moose business because he talked to me about that on the phone, several weeks ago, and I thought he might have had his Gerry the Moose with him. Perhaps, next year.

I guess that takes care of our basic items on the summary. We are a little bit a head of schedule. For all of us, particularly the Directors who attended, since last Friday or Saturday, the Heritage Rivers Board Meeting in Cornerbook, we are probably just as glad to see the termination right around the corner, this afternoon and tomorrow.

CLOSING REMARKS

As Chairman, in terms of closing remarks, I think we have had some very excellent discussion, in my perspective, in what I have seen at the workshops in terms of the three areas that were discussed underneath the broad theme. There were excellent presentations by the panelists and good organization by the moderators. Perhaps, most importantly, we have been able to move ahead, very significantly, in terms of developing some very solid principles in terms of where parks play a role, not only with sustainable development, but also, basically, where we are going and where we are going to end up towards the turn of the decade.

Needless to say, the whole idea of the parks systems planning has also produced some interesting discussion and results in the past couple of days. The principles that will be forthcoming from us, as Council, to the Ministers, I think, are going to make some very significant strides in terms of solidifying this whole idea of the ecological component of our parks system and protected areas, the very core, I think, of what we are all about.

I just have a couple of other remarks in terms of activities. While we will clue up our business type things this afternoon, I remind you that tonight we begin the banquet at 6:30 with cocktails in the room adjacent to this one. Following that, of course, we will have the presentation of the FFPC Merit Awards to four very special people, three of whom are with us here tonight. Following that, we will also have some entertainment by a man named Peter Sousi, who is going to entertain us for an hour or so in the room adjacent.

We also have, of course, tomorrow, the last and final activity of the conference which begins in the wee hours of the morning. The bus will leave at 7:00 o'clock tomorrow morning sharp. It is going to be a long day, it is going to be a full day, it is going to be a very interesting and productive day and, from what I can gather, if the weather holds out reasonably well, we will get to see our puffins and there is a good chance that we will get to see a numerous number of whales on the boat tour as well. So, let us hope that we have early turnouts.

Also, you have in your registration package what we call an evaluation form or questionnaire. I would request that everyone take the opportunity to go through the evaluation form and fill it out because it will help us, particularly Charles, in terms of organizing future conferences.

I would also like to take the opportunity of thanking, in particular, my staff and everyone in the Division who has been working on this for the past year or year and a half in one way or another. I think we have done well and we have also done very much in terms of educating these other people from other provinces and other park agencies about what our parks system is about and, certainly, what Newfoundland itself is all about.

Last but not least, I want to thank Charles. If it had not been for Charles Velay, the kind of things we have had here this week, certainly, would not have been in place as they are. Charles, I am very much in support of your long-distance phone calls and teleconferences that we have had many, many times to put all these things in place.

So, other than that, on behalf of Council too, I thank Council. It might sound rather strange, but I also thank Council for giving us, as the host, a chance to organize and plan this particular event. It has been a challenging experience, but a very productive one. So, thank you very much and enjoy the rest of the field trip.

ADJOURNMENT

FEDERAL PROVINCIAL PARKS COUNCIL CONFERENCE DELEGATE LIST

Barry Diamond
Director of Parks & Recreation
Dept. of Lands & Forests
RR #1 Belmont
Colchester County, N.S.
B0M 1C0

Dale Smith
Manager, Parks and Recreation Planning
Dept. of Lands and Forests
RR #1 Belmont
Colchester County, N.S.
B0M 1C0

Doug Murray
Director
P.E.I. Provincial Parks
Box 2000
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C1A 7Z8

Jim Morell
Assistant Deputy Minister
Dept. Tourism, Recreation & Heritage
P.O. Box 12345
Fredericton, N.B.
E3B 5C3

Wayne Burley
Director, Technical Services Branch
Dept. of Tourism, Recreation & Heritage
P.O. Box 12345
Fredericton, N.B.
E3B 5C3

John Archibald
Executive Director
Major Projects
Dept. Tourism, Recreation & Heritage
P.O. Box 12345
Fredericton, N.B.
E3B 5C3

Norm Richards
Director
Ministry of Natural Resources
Provincial Parks & Recreational Areas Branch
Room 3329, Whitney Block
99 Wellesley Street West
Toronto, ON
M7A 1W3

Ken McCleary
Manager, Planning & Development
Provincial Parks & Recreational Areas Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Room 3326, Whitney Block
Queen's Park, Toronto, ON
M7A 1W3

Jack van der Meer
Park Class EA Coordinator
Provincial Parks & Recreational Areas Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Room 3329, Whitney Block
99 Wellesley Street West
Toronto, ON, M7A 1W3

Gordon Prouse
Director of Parks
Manitoba Parks
258 Portage Ave.
Winnipeg, MAN
R3C 0B6

Bill Watkins
Resource Planner
Manitoba Parks
258 Portage Ave.
Winnipeg, MAN
R3C 0B6

Alan Appleby
Assistant Deputy Minister
Sask. Parks & Renewalde Resources
Rm. 524   3211 Albert St.
Regina, Sask.
S4S 5W6

Linda Langford
Sask. Parks & Renewable Resources
3211 Albert St.
Regina, Sask.
S4S 5W6

Jerry Tranter
Acting Assistant Deputy Minister
Alberta Recreation and Parks
7th Floor, 10405 - Jasper Ave.
Edmonton, AB

Jake Masselink
Assistant Deputy Minister
B.C. Parks
4000 Seymour Place
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X5

Ian Robertson
Director, Parks, Resources & Regional Planning
Govt. of Yukon
Dept. Renewable Resources
Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6

Alan Vaughan
Assistant Deputy Minister
Economic Development & Tourism
Government of the N.W.T.
Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9

Peter Neugebauer
Director, Program Development
Economic, Development & Tourism
Govt. of the N.W.T.
Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9

Ian Rutherford
Director, National Parks
Canadian Parks Service
Dept. of Environment
10 Wellington St.
Hull, Que.
K1A 0H3

Neil Munro
Director, Policy, Planning and Research
Canadian Parks Service
Historic Properties, Upper Water Street
Halifax, N.S.
B3J 1S9

Gary Sealey
Director, Visitors Activities Branch
Les Terrasses de la Chardiere
Ottawa, ON
K1A 1G2

Ney Landrum
Executive Director
National Association of State Parks Director
126 Mill Branch Rd.
Tallahassee
Florida, U.S.A.
32312

Arlin Hackman
Director, Endangered Spaces Campaign
World Wildlife Fund Canada
#201, 60 St. Clair Ave. East
Toronto, ON
M4T 1N5

Jim Inder
Assistant Deputy Minister
Dept. of Environment & Lands
Confederation Bldg. West
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Donald G. Hustins
Director of Provincial Parks
Dept. of Environment & Lands
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Glen Ryan
Chief of Planning and Development
Parks Division
Dept. of Environment & Lands
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Harold Burgess
Chief of Operations
Parks Division
Dept. of Environment & Lands
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Joan Nurse
Chief of Information/Education
Parks Division
Dept. of Environment and Lands
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Gerald March
Regional Supervisor
Parks Division, Dept. of Environment & Lands
P.O. Box 186
Whitbourne, NF
A0B 3K0

Dave Rolls
Regional Supervisor
Parks Division, Dept. of Environment & Lands
P.O. Box 147
Pasadena, NF
A0L 1K0

Albert Samms
Regional Supervisor
Parks Division, Dept. of Environment & Lands
35 Alabama Drive
Stephenville, NF
A2N 3K9

Gary Milley
Executive Director
Newfoundland & Labrador Park & Recreation Assoc.
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NF
A1B 4J6

Barb Taylor
WERAC Member
Wilderness & Ecological Reserves Council
Box 510, RR #1
Paradise, NF
A1L 1C1

Heather Griffin
Atlantic Centre for the Environment
Box 3, Nagles Place
St. John's, NF
A1B 2Z2

Charles J. Velay
Coordinator F.P.P.C.
4000 Seymour Place
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X5

Appendix B

federal provincial parks council
conseil fédéral-provincial des parcs

Agenda

29th Annual Conference

July 17-20, 1990
Hotel Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland

Theme:

"Parks, Protection and Sustainable Development"

Tuesday, July 17, 1990

7:30 am	Breakfast for the Executive Signal Room	
8:00 am	Meeting of Executive Chairman: Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland	Signal Room
9:00 am	Meeting of Directors Chariman: Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland	Salon C - D
10:15 am	Refreshment Break	
10:30 am	Meeting of Directors (cont'd)	Salon C - D
12:00 pm	Directors' Luncheon	Signal Room
12:30 - 7:00 pm	Registration	Hotel Lobby
1:00 pm	Meeting of Directors (cont'd)	Salon C - D
3:00 pm	Refreshment Break	
3:15 pm	Meeting of Directors (cont'd)	Salon C - D
5:00 pm	Dinner Break	
6:30 pm	Bus departs lobby of Hotel Newfoundland for Reception at Bowring Park	
9:00 pm	Bus returns to Hotel	

Wednesday, July 18, 1990

8:00 am	Registration Hotel Lobby	
9:00 am	Official Opening Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland Honourable O.P.J. (Jim) Kelland Minister of Environment and Lands Province of Newfoundland His Worship Mayor John Murphy City of St. John's	Salon C - D
9:20 am	Chairman's Address Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland	
9:30 am	Report on Deputy Ministers' Meeting Alan Appleby Province of Saskatchewan	
9:40 am	Report on Park Officer Courses Wayne Burley Province of New Brunswick	
9:50 am	Report of Executive/Directors' Meeting Charles Velay FPPC Co-ordinator	
10:00 am	Report on Parks Day 1990 Jake Masselink Province of British Columbia	
10:15 am	Report of NASPD Ney Landrum State of Florida	
10:30 am	Refreshment Break	
10:45 am	State of the Nation Reports Chairman: Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland	Salon C - D
12:30 pm	Lunch Break	

Wednesday, July 18, 1990 (cont'd)

2:00 pm State of the Nation Reports (cont'd) Salon C - D
Chairman: Donald G. Hustins

300 pm Refreshment Break

3:15 pm Concurrent Workshops A - B

Waorkshop A: **Sustainable Development Through Parks Systems Planning** Salon C - D

Moderator: Ian Rutherford
Canada

Speakers: Arlin Hackman
World Wildlife Fund

Rick McCubbin
Protected Areas Association
Newfoundland

Ken McCleary
Province of Ontario

Workshop B: **Parks Role and Participation in Sustainable Development** Signal Room

Moderator: Gordon Prouse
Province of Manitoba

Speakers: Bill Watkins
Province of Manitoba

Dr. Jon Lien
Protected Areas Association
Newfoundland

Alan Appleby
Province of Saskatchewan

5:00 pm Dinner Break

6:30 pm Bus departs lobby of Hotel Newfoundland for tour of Cape Spear National Historic Park

Host: Canada

Reception at Signal Hill National Historic Park Visitor Centre

Host: Canada

10:00 pm Bus returns to Hotel

Thursday, July 19, 1990

8:30 am	Concurrent Workshops B and C	
Workshop B:	**Parks Role and Participation in Sustainable Development**	Salon C - D
Workshop C:	**Two Case Studies**	Signal Room
	Moderator:	Barry Diamond Province of Nova Scotia
	Speakers:	Bob Halfyard Province of Newfoundland
		Jake Masselink Province of British
Columbia		
10:00	Refreshment Break	
10:15 am	Concurrent Workshops A and C	
Workshop A:	**Sustainable Development Through Parks System Planning**	Signal Room
Workshop C:	**Two Case Studies**	Salon C - D
12:00 pm	Lunch Break	
1:30 pm	Summary of Workshops/ Open Discussion	Salon C - D
	Chairman:	Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland
	Panellists:	Ian Rutherford Canada
		Gordon Prouse Province of Manitoba
		Barry Diamond Province of Nova Scotia
3:00 pm	Refreshment Break	
3:15	Conference Summary 1991 Federal - Provincial Parks Conference Jake Masselink Province of British Columbia	
	Closing Remarks Donald G. Hustins Province of Newfoundland	
6:30 pm	Cocktails Cash Bar	Salon B
7:00 pm	Banquet and Awards	Salon B

Conference Banquet

Host:	James Inder Assistant Deputy Minister Department of Environment and Lands
6:30 pm	Cash Bar
7:00 pm	Table Seating Welcome by Mr. James Inder
7:05 pm	Grace, Mr. James Newhook
7:10 - 8:00 pm	Dinner
8:00 - 8:15 pm	Introduction of Head Table Guests Greetings from the Minister, The Honourable O.P.J. (Jim) Kelland
8:15	Presentation of Awards Mr. Alan Appleby, Saskatchewan
Recipients:	Austin Patey, Nfld. James Newhook, Nfld. George Draskoy, Nfld. Grant Tayler, CPS
9:00 pm	Entertainment by Peter Soucy
10:00 pm	Closing Remarks By Mr. James Inder
10:15 - 10:30 pm	Cash Bar

Friday, July 20, 1990

Southern Avalon Field Trip Itinerary

7:00 am	Depart Newfoundland Hotel
7:30 am	Boat Tour of Witless Bay Islands Seabird Reserve
11:00 am	Tour of La Manche Provincial Park
11:40 am	Tour of Ferryland Museum and Historic Sites
1:00 pm	Chance Cove Provincial Park Mussel Boil Lunch and Beachcombing
3:30 pm	Viewing of the Avalon Caribou Herd
6:00 pm	Supper with local Newfoundland entertainment at the Beach Cottage, Holyrood
11:00 pm	Return to Newfoundland